

The *Libor Ardizonis*: Reshaping the *Libri Feudorum* in the Thirteenth Century

Attilio Stella

Date of deposit	20 12 2019
Document version	Author's accepted manuscript
Access rights	Copyright © 2017 Fondazione CISAM. All rights reserved. This work has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies or with permission. Permission for further reuse of this content should be sought from the publisher or the rights holder. This is the author created accepted manuscript following peer review and may differ slightly from the final published version.
Citation for published version	Stella, A. (2017). The <i>Liber Ardizonis</i> : reshaping the <i>Libri Feudorum</i> in the Thirteenth Century. In <i>Studi Medievali III serie</i> (pp. 175-227). (Studi Medievali; Vol. LVIII, No. 1). Fondazione CISAM.
Link to published version	https://shop.cisam.org/index.php?route=product/product&product_id=967

Full metadata for this item is available in St Andrews Research Repository at: <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

The *Liber Ardizonis*. Reshaping the *Libri Feudorum* in the Thirteenth Century

1. Iacobus de Ardizone and legal history

About one century ago, historians believed Iacobus de Ardizone de Broilo (c. 1200 – † 1254), a pupil of Azo and Hugolinus at Bologna, to be one of the central figures in the history of the *Libri Feudorum*. In the early nineteenth century, the citation apparatus of his *Summa feudorum* provided the first evidence of a second recension of the *Libri Feudorum*, which was thus named *recensio ardizoniana*.¹ The *Summa* became soon a milestone in legal history and Iacobus one of the earliest innovators of feudal law. However, in 1934, Edouard Meijers² proved that this *recensio* was already available in the late twelfth century, some decades before Iacobus was born. This discovery entailed a dramatic decrease of the historians' interest towards Iacobus's role in the codification of feudal law, even though he was still credited as the author of the so-called *Capitula extraordinaria Iacobi de Ardizone* – which Karl Lehmann inserted in his critical edition³ – and what Emil Seckel called *Extravaganten-Sammlung Ardizos*, an extensive collection of *extravagantes* to the *Libri Feudorum*.⁴

The *extravagantes* were laws or fragments on feudal matters which were generally copied after the text of the *Libri Feudorum* and some of which would reach its standard text. Analysing the exceptionally generous ms *Wien 2094*,⁵ Seckel showed that Iacobus collected a remarkable number of *extravagantes* which he systematised and inserted in his copy of the

¹ E.A. LASPEYRES, *Über die Entstehung und älteste Bearbeitung der Libri feudorum*, Berlin, 1830, pp. 46-62.

² E.M. MEIJERS, *Les glossateurs et le droit féodal*, in *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis*, 13 (1934), pp. 137-140.

³ K. LEHMANN, *Das langobardische Lehnrecht* (Handschriften, Textentwicklung, ältester Text und Vulgattext nebst den capitula extraordinaria), Göttingen, 1896. I rely on this edition in the references to the *Libri Feudorum*. Lehmann offered a synoptic edition of the *Libri* comparing the first version (*antiqua*) with the latest one (*vulgata*). I refer to the former as LF Ant., and to the latter as LF I (*Libri Feudorum*, book 1) or LF II (*Libri Feudorum*, book 2).

⁴ E. SECKEL, *Quellenfunde zum lombardischen Lehnrecht, insbesondere zu den Extravaganten-Sammlungen*, in *Festgabe der Berliner juristischen Fakultät für Otto Gierke zum Doktor-Jubiläum 21. August 1910*, I, *Staatsrecht. Verwaltungsrecht. Kirchenrecht. Lehnrecht*, Breslau 1910, pp. 47-168.

⁵ The manuscript is WIEN, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, hs. 2094 (hereinafter: *Wien 2094*).

Libri. The result was a re-shaping (*Rekonzinnation*) of the code whose index Seckel found in *Wien 2094* (f. 72ra-rc) as the *Compilacio Feudorum secundum Ar(dizonem)*, which outlined the text proper of the *Libri* (titles A-O) augmented of nine titles (O'-Y). The text of the last four titles of the index (T-Y) was partially transcribed in another section of *Wien 2094* (Extr. I-IV), as the first part of a wider collection of fifteen titles (Extr. I-XV). For this reason, Seckel identified titles A-S of the *Compilacio* as the *Liber Ardizonis*; as we will see more in detail, he thought O'-S as a batch Iacobus had received from an unknown compiler. Consequently, the jurist worked only on the second collection, which, however, he assembled only partially (namely Extr. I-V, VI. 1-2, VII. 2). Iacobus completed this *extravagantes* collection after 1234, and utilised it extensively in his *Summa Feudorum*.⁶ In a survey of the manuscript traditions of the *Libri Feudorum*, Peter Weimar agreed with all of Seckel's points, except for the authorship of O'-S, which he attributed to Iacobus.⁷ One crucial point on which the two authors concur, is that in the early thirteenth century the *Libri* were not thought as an unmodifiable text, since, besides the tradition which would lead to the definitive version of the code – the so-called *Liber Accursii*, codified by the great glossator Accursius – different *Rekonzinnationen*, readjustments of the text, circulated. The *Liber Ardizonis* was the earliest example, but other ones were available: the *Liber Odofredi* by Odofredo Denari, the *Liber Symonis* by Simon Vicentinus, and the *Liber Iacobi de Aurelianis* by Jacques d'Orleans.⁸

The aim of this article is to shed new light on the *Liber Ardizonis* contextualised in the history of the codification of feudal law, by comparing the manuscript traditions of Iacobus's

⁶ Seckel offers an analysis of the index and of the sources of the second collection Extr. I-XV in SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 136-152 and 73-114, respectively. Extr. I-XV is split in two different sections of *Wien 2094*: ff. 53ra-54vb and 22ra-24rb. **Appendix 1** of this essay offers a synoptic table of the titles of the index of the *compilacio secundum Ar(dizonem)* compared with the *vulgata* and *antiqua* versions of the *Libri Feudorum*, whereas **Appendix 2** reports titles Extr. I-XV, to which I refer throughout the whole article.

⁷ P. WEIMAR, *Die Handschriften des Liber feudorum und seiner Glossen*, in *Rivista internazionale di diritto comune*, 1 (1990), pp. 31-98, in part. pp. 41-42 and 68-69.

⁸ On the tradition connecting the *Liber Iacobi Columbi de Regio* – by Iacobus Columbi – to the codification of the *Liber Accursii*, see: *ibid.*: pp. 46-70. Weimar also casts doubts on the *Liber Symonis* and the *Liber Iacobi de Aurelianis* as actual *Rekonzinnationen* of the *Libri* (*ibid.*, p. 31-32); however, the glosses to *Wien 2094* edited by Seckel suggest that these books contained some substantial differences in comparison with the text proper of the *Libri*. Seckel also analysed the structure of the *Liber Odofredi*: SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 63-68.

Summa feudorum with new and old evidence about Iacobus's life and writings. I make use in the first place of the *editio princeps* published in Asti in 1518, referring to it as *Asti 1518*, to distinguish it from the versions transmitted in different manuscript traditions.⁹ Since the *Summa* is the primary source for the study of the *Liber Ardizonis*, it is opportune to start from the *status quaestionis* of its writing process. Laspeyres, who was the first to realise the potential of this treatise as a source for the analysis of the *Libri*, elaborated the first hypothesis about its drafting. In the *prooemium*, Iacobus admitted to having added and removed material repeatedly to his opus, justifying thus a protracted elaboration process.¹⁰ In the incipit, he also wrote two revealing sentences:

Cum Bononie fere amore legalis sciencie discende exulassem et personam ibidem exinanissem, quod sepe scolares facere contingit. (*Asti 1518*, f. 3ra)

Tandem destructibili tempore olim gloriose civitatis Verone et seditionis intrinsece, aliis sollicitudinibus destitutus, hoc opusculum [...] explevi. (*Asti 1518*, f. 3rb)

Laspeyres believed this internal sedition (*sedition intrinseca*) to be the war between rival factions of Verona, led respectively by the marquises d'Este and Ezzelino da Romano, in which the former were defeated, and their followers exiled in 1225-6.¹¹ According to Laspeyres, Iacobus was banished that year and sought refuge in Bologna, where he lived in exile («exulassem») and began his academic studies. Based on his remarkable analysis of *Asti 1510*, Laspeyres believed Iacobus to have finished a first draft of the *Summa* shortly after 1227 and completed a definitive version between 1234 and 1240.¹² He derived these last dates from five points:

⁹ IACOBUS DE ARDIZONE, *Summa super usibus feudorum composite per dominum Iacobum de domino Ardizzone de Verona hactenus non impressa*, Astae, 1510. Anast. reprint in: *Corpus glossatorum iuris civilis*, V, edidit M. VIOLA, Augustae Taurinorum (1970).

¹⁰ *Asti 1518*, f. 3ra-rb: «Per tempora hucusque presenti operi prout mihi videbatur utilius adieci atque detraxi».

¹¹ On this war, see: L. SIMEONI, *Il comune veronese sino ad Ezzelino e il suo primo statuto*, in *Miscellanea di Storia Veneta*, ser. 3a, XV (1922) [also available in *Studi storici veronesi*, 10 (1959)], pp. 1-131; A. CASTAGNETTI, *La Marca Veronese-Trevigiana*, in *Storia d'Italia* diretta da G. GALASSO, VII/1, Torino, 1987, pp. 235-237 et passim.

¹² The dense argumentation about the *termini post* and *ante quem* of 1227-1240 is in: LASPEYRES, *Über die Entstehung*, cit. (footnote 1), pp. 67-77. As to the *terminus post quem*, the author was puzzled by two points: first, although Iacobus probably began his opus in Bologna, he did not cite the *Constitutio in Basilica sancti Petri* issued by Frederick II in 1220, which was included in the new versions of the *Corpus iuris civilis*. Second, Iacobus cited statutes of Verona dating before 1225, so he probably started writing before then, i.e., before being

(1) the *Summa* cites the *Liber Extra* of Pope Gregory IX, which was compiled in 1234, and (2) Iacobus's *summa De decurionibus* (C. 10.32), which Laspeyres thought to be concluded after 1233. (3) Laspeyres interpreted the «destructible time of the once glorious Verona and its internal subversion», that is, when Iacobus admitted to having concluded his treatise, with the beginning of Ezzelino's «arbitrary and cruel tyranny» («die willkürlichste und grausamste Tyrannei»), which he individuated in 1235-40.¹³ (4) Emperor Frederick II is mentioned as still alive («iste nunc Federicus Rogerius Imperator»). This element would place the conclusion of the *Summa* before 1250, but (5) since around 1240 Jean Blanc, a French jurist who studied in Modena, brought a copy of the treatise to Marseille, his hometown, the *terminus ante quem* was thus 1240.¹⁴ These dates have been long accepted, with only a minor modification since Gérard Giordanengo proved Jean Blanc to be back to Marseille already in 1237, backdating Laspeyres's *terminus ante quem* of at least three years.¹⁵

Collecting data from previous studies and new archival evidence of Verona, Iacobus's hometown, a recent survey by Gian Maria Varanini – to which, *si parva licet*, I partly contributed – elaborated an updated profile of Iacobus's life, bringing back the jurist to his socio-political background.¹⁶ Varanini definitively proved that Iacobus's academic experience in Bologna must have taken place in 1224-1228, years in which he does not appear in the

banished from his hometown. Formal analysis of Canon law sources in *Asti 1518* proved that he originally used sources prior to 1227, updating them only after 1234.

¹³ The quotation is from: Ibid., p. 71. IACOBUS DE ARDIZONE, *Summa de decurionibus*, in AZO, *Summa super codicem, instituta, extraordinaria*, Papiae, 1506, anastatic reprint in: *Corpus glossatorum iuris civilis*, II, edidit M. VIORA, Augustae Taurinorum, 1966, ff. 446-455.

¹⁴ LASPEYRES, *Über die Entstehung*, cit. (footnote 1), pp. 72-73.

¹⁵ G. GIORDANENGO, *Jean Blanc, feudiste de Marseille (XIII^e siècle)*, in *Université de Bordeaux I. Annales de la faculté de droit. Centre d'études et de recherches d'histoire institutionnelle et régionale*, 2 (1978) [now in Id., *Féodalités et droits savants dans le Midi médiéval*, Aldershot, 1992], p. 73. Notwithstanding this finding, in his repertoire of medieval jurists, H. Lange still accepts Laspeyres's *terminus*: H. LANGE, *Römisches Recht im Mittelalter*, I, *Die Glossatoren*, München, 1997, pp. 279-282.

¹⁶ G. MOSCHETTI, *Il cartularium veronese del magister Ventura del secolo XIII*, Napoli, 1990; G. DE SANDRE GASPARINI, *Tra religione e politica. La famiglia veronese De Broilo, le religiones novae, Ezzelino da Romano*, in *Tempi, uomini ed eventi di storia veneta. Studi in onore di Federico Seneca*, a cura di S. Perini, Rovigo, 2003, pp. 95-112; G.M. VARANINI, *Iacopo di Ardizzone e la sua famiglia nella documentazione veronese*, first part of G.M. VARANINI, A. STELLA, *Scenari veronesi per la Summa Feudorum di Iacopo di Ardizzone da Broilo*, in *Honos alit artes. Studi per il settantesimo compleanno di Mario Ascheri*, a cura di P. MAFFEI e G.M. VARANINI, I, *La formazione del diritto comune. Giuristi e diritti in Europa (secoli XII-XVII)*, Firenze 2014, pp. 256-265.

local documentation.¹⁷ However, Iacobus's 'exile' in Bologna could not be the result of a banishment, for in his first appearance in 1229 Iacobus fulfilled an important civic office – *iudex appellacionum* – and one year later he had an active role in mediating between the two opposed factions. Varanini stressed that Ezzelino did not impose any «arbitrary and cruel tyranny» in the 1230s; in fact, the first extensive banishments from Verona occurred only in 1239, and the hegemonic presence of Ezzelino had substantial effects on civic institutions only in the late 1240s.¹⁸ One detail which Varanini overlooked may even strengthen his point decisively: the passage of the *prooemium* that Laspeyres took as a proof of banishment was nothing but a rephrased quotation from Fredrick I's *Privilegium scholasticum*, which Iacobus cites just after considering his 'exile' and 'poverty'.¹⁹ Varanini also had the merit to individuate a unique and late source, determining the date of Iacobus's death, sentenced by Ezzelino in 1254. This discovery, and the fact that our lawyer disappeared from documentation after 1250 induced Varanini to suggest that the «destructible time» of the «internal subversion» of Verona referred to the early 1250s. Therefore, Iacobus would have concluded his *Summa* in this period of seclusion, once he had been «relieved from other tasks».²⁰

Such an attentive contextualisation of the author, however, does not match two correct suggestions by Laspeyres. First, if it is true that Iacobus completed the *Summa* in the 1250s, it is not clear why he did not modify the passage describing Frederick II as still alive,

¹⁷ On 23 October 1223, an undoubtedly young Iacobus – *dominus Iacobinus* – was among the witnesses of a feudal investiture to a canon of the Veronese chapter. When his father Ardizzone retired to religious life, around 1225, Iacobus vanished from the documentation, to reappear only in 1229, as *iudex appellacionum*. Ibid., p. 260. During his eclipse, of his four brothers, all sufficiently represented in the records of the 1230s, I found evidence of only one, the notary Ognibene, who appeared just once, in 1226: CITTÀ DEL VATICANO, Archivum Secretum Vaticanum, Fondo Veneto I, perg. 9221.

¹⁸ G.M. VARANINI, *Il comune di Verona, la società cittadina ed Ezzelino III da Romano 1239-1259*, in *Nuovi studi ezzeliniani*, I, a cura di G. CRACCO, Roma 1992, pp. 115-160.

¹⁹ *Asti 1518*, f. 3ra: «Cum Bononie fere *amore legalis scientiae exulasse*, et personam ibidem *exinanissem*, quod sepe *scholares* facere contingit, ut in De Privilegio Scholastico, Authentica Habita super hec». The text of the *authentica habita* reads: «Quis enim eorum non misereatur, cum *amore scientie facti exules*, de divitibus pauperes semetipsos *exinaniunt*, vitam suam omnibus periculis exponunt et a vilissimis sepe hominibus, quod graviter ferendum est, corporales iniurias sine causa perferunt» (FRIDERICI I *Constitutiones*, M.G.H., *Legum* IV/I, p. 249). Iacobus took this law into great consideration, as he inserted it in his *extravagantes* collection as Extr. V.

²⁰ The source is a previously unknown sixteenth-century chronicle by Girolamo Dalle Vacche: VARANINI, *Iacopo di Ardizzone*, cit. (footnote 16), pp. 264-265.

even though he died in 1250 since he admittedly took much care in updating his writing. Second, since Jean Blanc brought a copy of the *Summa* in Marseille already in 1237, there must have been at least one version compiled before that date. Therefore, the question needs further analysis. On the other hand, also Laspeyres's suggestions need to be updated in light of both such new evidence and the manuscript traditions of the *Summa*, which, unfortunately, after Seckel's efforts, have been substantially overlooked.

The analysis I carried out on the manuscript traditions of the *Summa* confirmed that the treatise was the outcome of constant adjustments. Moreover, the citation apparatus of the different versions also revealed the changing structure of the *Liber Ardiŕonis*, which Iacobus was updating simultaneously. The dialectic between the two texts offered thus new insights on the process of codification of feudal law, as it became evident that Iacobus had in mind a bold systematisation of all the available sources of feudal law, and that he handled all the material which would constitute the definitive version of the *Libri*, the *vulgata* glossed by Accursius. Thus, this article aims to restore the role of Iacobus in the history of feudal law. Recent reassessments on the activity of Iacobus Columbi († 1244 ca.) on Pilius's gloss and *Summa feudorum*, make of Iacobus de Ardizzone one of the earliest Civilians, after Pilius, to work on the *Libri Feudorum*.²¹ Indeed, both the *Liber Ardiŕonis* and the *Summa* – the widest known works in this genre for the thirteenth century – were broadly known among medieval jurists: Jean Blanc reused entire chapters of the *Summa*, whereas Jacques d'Orleans glossed or even interpolated it.²² The Pseudo-Revigny used the *Liber Ardiŕonis* as a primary source.²³ Baldus de Ubaldi (1327-1400) listed Iacobus among the *magni viri glosatores*;²⁴ Iacobus

²¹ WEIMAR, *Die Handschriften*, cit. (footnote 7), pp. 46-49 and 83-87. Even though the question it is still open, Columbi's personal contribution to the feudal law would be reduced to a minor reshaping of the *Summa Feudorum* of Pilius: M. MONTORZI, *I giuristi e il diritto feudale*, in *Il contributo italiano alla storia del pensiero. Diritto*, a cura di P. CAPPELLINI, P. COSTA, M. FIORAVANTI, B. SORDI, pp. 35-42. Giordanengo does not include Columbi among the medieval feudists: G. GIORDANENGO, *La littérature juridique féodale*, in *Le vassal, le fief et l'écrit. Pratiques d'écriture et enjeux documentaires dans le champ de la féodalité (XIe-XVe s.)*, Actes de la journée d'étude organisée à Louvain-la-Neuve le 15 avril 2005, J.-F. NIEUS (ed.), Turnhout, 2008, pp. 31-34.

²² GIORDANENGO, *Jean Blanc*, cit. (footnote 15); SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 61-62.

²³ About this controverted author, see: **Infra**, footnote 75.

²⁴ BALDUS UBALDI PERUSINUS, *In feudorum usus commentaria*, Venetiis 1580, f. 2vb.

Alvarotti (1385-1453), a professor in Padua, described him as one of the most excellent authors of feudal law.²⁵

2. The *Libri Feudorum* and the *Liber Ardizonis*

Despite a series of reassessments, historians agree on the existence of three phases of codification of the *Libri*.²⁶ The so-called *recensio antiqua* or *obertina* (ca. 1150-60s), the *recensio ardizoniana* (1180-1190s), and the *vulgata* (1250 ca.). The *antiqua* consists of seven essays collected together probably around 1150, even though some of them were written before 1136. The two only authors whose name are known prove the origin of this ancient compilation in Pavia and Milan: Ugo de Gambolò, a judge from Pavia, and Obertus de Orto († 1175), the famous Milanese lawyer.²⁷ The *recensio ardizoniana* took its name after Iacobus de Ardizzone, whose *Summa* – namely, its citation apparatus – provided the first evidence of a second version of the *Libri Feudorum*.²⁸ Although today we know of its availability decades

²⁵ «Fuit praeterea inter alios summista excellens Iac(obus) Ardizoni (!) Veronensis qui summam adeo copiosam scripsit hisque iuribus feudalibus redundantem, ut nihil in ea quod ad rem feudalem pertineat intactum relinquitur»: IACOBUS ALVAROTUS, *Super Feudis*, Lugduni, 1545, f. 2ra.

²⁶ WEIMAR, *Die Handschriften*, cit. (footnote 7), pp. 32-67.

²⁷ The *antiqua* encompasses the texts corresponding to titles *LF Ant.* 1-10 = *LF I.* 1 – II. 24, in the synoptic edition of Lehmann, with the exclusion of *LF II.* 6 and II. 7pr ('De forma fidelitatis' and 'De nova forma fidelitatis'), and with a title – the 'Capitula Ugonis' (*Ant.* 9. 1-5) – that would not figure in the *vulgata*. The four earlier essays, *Ant.* 1-2 (= *LF I.* 1-6), *Ant.* 3-5 (= *LF I.* 7-13), *Ant.* 6. 7-16 (= *LF I.* 19-24), and *Ant.* 7-8 (= *LF I.* 25-28), are from unknown authors, and provide sometimes discordant interpretations of two imperial laws of Conrad II (*Constitutio de beneficiis*, 1037: CONRADUS II, *Constitutiones*, M.G.H., Leges IV/1, pp. 89-91) and Lothar III (Laws of Roncaglia, 1136, eventually included in the Vulgate as *LF II.* 51 part 1). One of these ancient writings bears the name of Ugo de Gambolò, the author of the so-called *Capitula Ugonis*. The title's heading is: *Haec fecit Ugo de Gambolato usque ad epistolam Oberti*. This text appears twice, with slight differences, in *LF Ant.* 6. 1-6 and *Ant.* 9. 1-5, even though only the former reached the *vulgata* (*LF I.* 14-18). Obertus de Orto – after whom the alternative nomenclature of the *antiqua*: *recensio obertina* – is the author of two letters to his son Anselminus, a student in Bologna, which are the last texts to reach the *antiqua*: *LF Ant.* 8. 1-29 (= *LF II.* 1-5, 7 § 1-22); *Ant.* 10. 1-2 (= *LF II.* 23-24). G. DI RENZO VILLATA, *La formazione dei Libri Feudorum (tra pratica di giudici e scienza di dottori...)*, in *Il feudalesimo nell'Alto Medioevo*, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, XLVII, Spoleto, 2000, pp. 651-721.

²⁸ WEIMAR, *Die Handschriften*, cit. (footnote 7), pp. 42-46, identified twenty-one manuscripts transmitting this recension.

before Iacobus was born, it is still conventionally called *ardizoniana*. In this phase, the text proper was augmented of twenty-six titles (LF II. 25-51) and subdivided into two books, as in all the later *recensiones*. These additions consist of two batches entrenched in the Milanese legal practice, mentioning *consilia* of Milanese lawyers such as Obertus de Orto and Gerardus Cagapistus (LF II. 25-26 and 27-51),²⁹ and an 1152 constitution of Emperor Frederick I (LF II. 27), known as *De pace tenenda*.³⁰ As we will see, the insertion of this constitution has raised debate, for it was missing in the manuscript glossed before 1207 by Pilius and historians have thought the same of the copy used by Iacobus. However, the most striking peculiarity of the early-thirteenth-century manuscripts, is the occurrence of a variable number of *extravagantes* – consisting of imperial laws, fragments of treatises, and Canon law material – copied without apparent logic or order at the end of the text proper – after LF II.51.

Only some of these *extravagantes* eventually reached the Accursian tradition, which led to the *vulgata*. Among them: seven imperial constitutions on fiefs,³¹ an ancient formula for the feudal oath written by Fulbert of Chartres in 1020 (LF II. 6),³² another formula allegedly imposed by common usage («utentium approbata consuetudine») (LF II. 7pr), and a fragmentary selection of glosses known as *De notis feudorum* (LF II. 58). Around 1250, Accursius completed Pilius's gloss to the *Libri* augmented of these titles, legitimising thus its authoritative nature and justifying its inclusion in the *Authenticum*. Although this inclusion

²⁹ Gerardus Cagapistus was himself the author of glosses to the *Libri Feudorum*: E. BESTA, *Fonti*, in *Storia del diritto italiano*, I/2, a cura di P. DEL GIUDICE, Milano, 1925, p. 442.

³⁰ FRIDERICUS I, *Constitutiones*, M.G.H., Leges IV/I, pp. 194-198.

³¹ The three laws issued at Roncaglia by Frederick I in 1158: the constitution *Hac edictali* (LF II. 53-54); the law *Imperialem decet* (LF II. 55); the law *Regalia sunt* (LF II. 56). Then, three laws attributed to Lothair III: the *Imperialis benevolentie* of 1136 (II. 52 part I); the decree *Satis bene*, and the 1127 law *Quoniam inter* (II. 52 part II and III); eventually, the constitution *Si vasallus* wrongly attributed to Henry III (1039-56) (LF II.57). A series of other imperial laws remained *extravagantes*: The imperial constitutions are: Conrad II's *constitutio de beneficiis In nomine* (1037), Frederick I's scholastic privilege *Habita* (1158 or 1155), Frederick I's *constitutio Hac edictali* (1177), the Peace of Constance (1183), and Frederick II's coronation act *Ad decus* (1220). Among the other *extravagantes* excluded by the Vulgate, are most notably the *summulae* of Anselmus de Orto, son of Obertus: WEIMAR, *Die Handschriften*, cit. (footnote 7), p. 98.

³² G. GIORDANENGO, *Epistola Philiberti. Note sur l'influence du droit féodal savant dans la pratique du Dauphiné medieval*, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 82 (1970), pp. 809-853.

granted broad diffusion to the code and imposed the *vulgata* as the standard text, alternative compilations continued to circulate, the earliest of which was the *Liber Ardigonis*.

This collection, which represents the first attempt to systematise the fluid mass of *extravagantes*, was a readjustment based on a *recensio ardigoniana* of the *Libri*, only seemingly identical to the one on which Pilius had worked before 1207 and which did not include LF II.27 (*De pace tenenda*) yet. The index of the *compilacio secundum Ar(digonem)* presents this law outside the text proper, ending with title O, in a collection (O'-S) which Seckel believed to be compiled by an unknown author.³³ He took the absence of II. 27 from the text proper as proof that Iacobus did not know about this constitution before receiving the batch O'-S. Meijers confirmed this suggestion by supposing the continuity of the copy of the *Libri Feudorum* originally used by Iacobus with the tradition utilised by Pilius.³⁴ Two elements convinced Seckel that Iacobus did not compile O'-S. Titles T-Y, of which the *compilacio* provides just the headings, correspond with the first four titles (Extr. I-IV) of the *extravagantes* collection partially transcribed in *Wien 2094*.³⁵ Now, this batch contained all the chapters listed under title O'-S of the index – and much more. When Iacobus cited these chapters in his *Summa*, he always mentioned them in the form they assumed in Extr. I-IV. The duplication of this material and the citation of only the second collection proved thus the original unrelatedness of Iacobus and O'-S. This, however, did not prevent Seckel from deeming title S as the last of the *Liber Ardigonis* and the following titles as Iacobus's *extravagantes* collection. Eventually, he proved that Iacobus compiled only part of the

³³ See **Appendix 1**. In the collection O'-S, the constitution appeared under title Q. *De pace tenenda*, after titles O' (with no header) and P (*Que sit forma sacramenti et qualiter iurare debeat vasallus*), before titles R (*Que sint regalie*) and S (*De pace Constanciae*). The *Liber Ardigonis* presents another peculiarity: in the *antiqua* the last section of the sixth title is the famous constitution of Lothair III *Si quis ex militum ordine* (Ant. 6.7 – 6.16 = LF I. 19-24). The end of the matching title of the *Liber* (F. *Qualiter usus beneficii sit retinendus*) does not correspond with the end of the constitution, the last chapter of which (Ant. 6.16 = LF I. 24) is quite oddly inserted as the first chapter of the following title (G. *Qualiter iudicium feudi sit examinandum*), which is off-topic. This inconsistency is maybe the reason why Iacobus inserted under Extr. II. 19 the entire constitution of Lothair: **Appendix 2, ...**

³⁴ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 149-150; MEIJERS, *Les glossateurs*, cit. (footnote 2), pp. 137-138.

³⁵ See **Appendix 2**.

collection transmitted by *Wien 2094* (Extr. I-XV), namely Extr. I-VI.3, and VII.2.³⁶ Peter Weimar accepted most of Seckel's suggestions, holding titles A-S as the real *Liber Ardizonis* and the following batch as the *extravagantes* collection. However, he indicated Iacobus as the author of O'-S, which he concluded around 1230 or earlier. He also suggested that Iacobus extracted *LF* II.27 (*De pace tenenda*) from the text proper of his copy of the *Libri feudorum* and moved it to the collection O'-S, under title Q, together with other imperial constitutions.³⁷

The analysis of the manuscript traditions of Iacobus's *Summa* clarified most of these questions, supporting Weimar's insights on *LF* II.27 and the authorship of O'-S but also showing that Iacobus conceived of the second collection – Extr. I and the successive titles – as an integral part of the *Liber Ardizonis*, which was open to continuous additions.

3. The *Summa Feudorum Iacobi de Ardizone*: a living text

Despite the fact that seven manuscripts transmitting the *Summa* were available at Seckel's time, most of the analyses of its relations with the *Libri feudorum* relied on the printed edition *Asti 1518*, transmitting the *editio princeps* derived from a lost antigraph.³⁸ Today we know of nine manuscripts:

1. *Wien 2094*, ff. 29r-52v;
2. EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, E.I.10, ff. 1-59 (*El Escorial E.I.10*);
3. PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Lat. 4604, ff. 55r-67r (*Lat. 4604*);
4. PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Lat. 4677 ff. 1ra-55ra (*Lat. 4677*);
5. PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Lat. 16008, ff. 1-65 (*Lat. 16008*);
6. PARMA, Biblioteca Palatina, Lat. 1227, ff. 23-53 (*Parma 1227*);
7. NAPOLI, Biblioteca Nazionale, III.A.32 (*Napoli III.A.32*);
8. MADRID, Biblioteca Nacional, 577, ff. 117r-144r (*Madrid 577*);

³⁶ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 115-129 and 149-150.

³⁷ WEIMAR, *Die Handschriften*, cit. (footnote 7), p. 68.

³⁸ The only exceptions are the mentioned work of Seckel and a tangential interest of Vittore Colorni in a study about the «lost laws of Roncaglia»: V. COLORNI, *Le tre leggi perdute di Roncaglia*, in *Scritti in memoria di Antonino Giuffrè*, 1, Milano, 1966, pp. 111-170.

When I first approached these manuscripts, I aimed to identify which one could be considered the closest to the *editio princeps*, expecting to find only minor differences. In a first survey, I noticed that even though mss. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 contained references to the *Liber Extra*, and were thus successive to 1234, mss. 3, 8, and 9 did not transmit these citations. Therefore, I focused on them and realised that they presented a similar, peculiar structure and a text considerably shorter than that of the other traditions: they seemed incomplete, some chapters were entirely missing, and their citation apparatus drew from a much poorer corpus of legal sources. Since I suspected that *Lat. 4604* (ff. 55r-67r) transmitted the most ancient tradition, I analysed in depth this manuscript, comparing the results with evidence from *Urgell 2042* and *Madrid 577*.⁴⁰ The three traditions, all early fourteenth-century copies, differ from each other only under minor aspects, mostly the formulation of some sentences and the use of abbreviations, but bear a similar rubrication. References to Canon law sources in *Lat. 4604* suggest a dating of this stage of the *Summa* well before 1234. Of eighteen citations, four are to the *Decretum Gratiani*;⁴¹ one, deceptively to the *Decretum*, refers instead to a decretal of Pope Celestine III (1191-98) collected in the *Compilatio secunda* (1210-1218);⁴² one is to the *Compilatio prima* (1187-91)⁴³; ten are to the *Compilatio tertia* (1210)⁴⁴.

³⁹ LANGE, *Römisches*, cit. (footnote 15) p. 281, does not indicate the mss. *Madrid 577* and *Urgell 2042*, which are nonetheless listed in the database *Manuscripta Juridica*, developed under the direction of G. R. Dolezalek (<http://manuscripts.rg.mpg.de/>).

⁴⁰ I was initially convinced to base my analysis on *Urgell 2042*. However, the reading of *Lat. 4604*, which should have served only to verify my hypotheses, convinced me to use the Parisian manuscript, as it transmitted a less accurate citation apparatus than both *Urgell 2042* and *Madrid 577*. Its imperfections result clearly from the following footnotes. Even though only further comparison of the three traditions may dispel any doubt on the matter, I took low accuracy as a first proof of *Lat. 4604* to derive from an earlier tradition.

⁴¹ The references to the *Decretum* in *Lat. 4604* are: *XV q. III, Aliis, et C. ult(imo)* [Decr. C. 15 q. 6 c. 3 (*Aliis*) and c. 5 (*Iuratos*)] (ff. 58vb, 59va); *XI q. III, Non semper, et C. Si dominus ei iubet*; [Decr. C. 11 q. 3 c. 92, 93] (f. 58vb); *XXXIII, In lectum* [Decr. C. 34 q. 1 c. 6] (f. 59vb).

⁴² *Decre(tum), De exces(sibus) prelat(orum) (in subditos) § Sicut unire* [Comp. II, 5.13.4] (*Lat. 4604*, f. 60vb).

⁴³ *Extra De purg(atione) cano(nica) C. Quot(iens) in fi(ne)* [Comp. I, 5.29.4] (*Lat. 4604*, f. 65vb).

⁴⁴ The references to the *compilatio tertia* in *Lat. 4604* are: <Extra III> *De electione et electi po(testate), Venerabilem* [Comp. III 1.6.19] (f. 55va, 65va); *Ex(tra) <III> De Donac(ione), L. III* [Comp. III. 3.18.2 = X. 3.24.5] (ff. 55vb and 56ra); <Extra III> *De feu(dis), Cap. I, Lib. Tercio* [Comp. III, 3.16.1] (f. 60vb); *Ex(tra) III. De feu(dis)*,

The two remaining references to Canon law are to a decretal of Innocent III: «In Const. Innoc(entii) Cap(itulo) Excommunicamus § Si vero dominus» (*Lat. 4604*, ff. 58vb, 59va). This constitution was issued during the fourth Council of Lateran (1215) and was part of the *Compilatio quarta* (Comp. IV. 5.5.2), published between 1218 and 1226. Iacobus did not quote this code but cited the decretal as an individual law. Although all these sources date before 1218, Iacobus must have written this first version of the *Summa* after 1220, since the mention of Emperor Frederick II, crowned that year, is present (*Lat. 4604*, f. 65va). However, Iacobus did not use the constitution *Ad decus* issued at the emperor's coronation ceremony, which had absorbed the paragraph § *Si vero dominus* of the above-mentioned decretal of Innocent III.⁴⁵ Although he would do so in the later versions of the *Summa*, at this stage, he did not cite imperial legislation after Frederick I's (1152-1190).

The rubrication of *Lat. 4604* is incomplete – the headings of some titles and chapters are missing, and a blank space is left where the scribe should have copied the text in red ink (*rubrum*). Headings and blank spaces point towards a division in thirteen titles, whose headings I obtained from the text after the blank. For example, I derived title *De compositione i(dest) de pace tenenda et componenda*, which reports a blank space, from the first words of the following text: «supradictum est de interpellatione et de contentione, unde consequenter apponit de compositione i(dest) de pace tenenda et componenda» (*Lat. 4604*, f. 66vb). Analysing the reference apparatus, I reconstructed the titles composing the version of the *Libri Feudorum* upon which Iacobus relied. Such references are usually expressed by title, chapter – only occasionally – and paragraph, as follows:

i(nfra) De successione feudi (C. Si quis fuerit) § Nam

Mentions of chapters occur quite inconsistently even in citations to the same paragraph, making problematic any attempt to reconstruct the subdivision in detail.

Cap. Ex parte [Comp. III. 3.16.2 = X. 3.20.2] (ff. 55vb, 62va); *Ex(tra) III De ca(nsa) p(ossessionis)et propri(etatis)*, *Cap. I, § Per nos igitur, § Verum* [Comp. III, 2.5.1] (f. 56vb); *Ex(tra) III De evict. iurati [= De iureiurando]*, C. Veniens in fi. [Comp. III. 2.15.5] (f. 59ra); *Ex(tra) III De iuramento (!)*, C. *Decrevimus* [Urg. 2042: Ex. III. De iureiuran(do), C. Ea te credimus: Comp. III. 2.15.8] (f. 59ra).

⁴⁵ Incidentally, Iacobus inserted the constitution, including Innocent III's decretal, under title Extr. VI. 1: see **Appendix 2**.

However, the titles appeared very clearly and enabled a comparison between the structure of the *Summa* and the version of the *Libri Feudorum* Iacobus was using.

[Tab. 1]

4. Iacobus's *Summa* and the first *extravagantes* collection (O'-S)

Lat. 4604 transmits a tradition of the *Summa* which is subdivided into thirteen titles: A-M and title *De pace tenenda*. Its citation apparatus reflects a manuscript of the *Libri* containing five more titles: N, O, *Que sit forma sacramenti fidelitatis*, *Quod sit sacramentum fidelitatis iurandum*, *De pace Constanciae*. **Table 1** sheds light on four elements. (1) As Laspeyres proved for *Asti 1518*, also *Lat. 4604* offers a *Summa feudorum* which is a collection of *summae* to each title of the *Libri*, of which it reproduces the order. (2) This *Summa*, however, does not encompass all the titles of the *Libri* it cited and is, therefore, an incomplete draft; *Asti 1518*, indeed, covers all the text proper of the *Libri* (A-O) plus titles T-Y. (3) In *Lat. 4604*, the *summa* to title *De pace tenenda* (LF II. 27) occurs after the *summa* to title M (LF II. 24-26), which is the exact position it has in the *recensio ardiizoniana* and the *Vulgata*. (4) The *Libri* which Iacobus used at this stage were thus a copy of the *recensio ardiizoniana* transmitting title *De pace tenenda* in the place it would maintain in the *vulgata* but not containing the two collections of *extravagantes* as they are transmitted in *Wien 2094*.

Lat. 4604 provides thus a snapshot of the copy of the *Libri Feudorum* owned by Iacobus before he started working on the *Liber Ardiizonis*. However, as the citation apparatus contains as *extravagantes* almost all the sources that would soon enter the collection O'-S, therefore, it is evident that Iacobus was its author. I propose a brief analysis of this material, title by title, highlighting how Iacobus organised it. The structure of these titles is outlined in **Appendix 1**, in which I inserted after the chapters composing titles O'-S the reference to their occurrence in the second *extravagantes* collection, which I outline in **Appendix 2**.

Title O' [*Qui debeant succedere in feudum*].⁴⁶ All the chapters constituting this title appear in *Lat. 4604*: the *Constitutio de beneficiis* of Emperor Conrad II (1037) [O. 3 = Extr. II. 32: **Tab. 1** and

⁴⁶ *Wien 2094*, f. 72rb, does not detach this first group of *extravagantes* from title O of the text proper, whose title is *Qui debeant succedere in feudum*.

2], the constitutions of Roncaglia of Emperor Lothar II (1136) [O. 4 = Extr. II. 23 = *LF* II. 52 part I]; the dubious constitution *De militum* attributed to Emperor Henry III (1047-56)⁴⁷ [O. 5 = Extr. II. 33], which oddly appears in *SF* U § 1 (*Asti* 1518, f. 35vb), but in no manuscript tradition; the constitution *Imperialem decet solertiam* of Emperor Frederick I, issued at Roncaglia in 1158 [O. 6 = Extr. II. 24 = *LF* II. 55]. All these imperial laws reached Iacobus's second collection, under title Extr. II. It is very likely that Iacobus found them among the *extravagantes* of his copy of the *LF*. The *Constitutio de beneficiis*, for instance, recurs in eleven of the twenty-three manuscripts bearing *extravagantes*, according to Weimar's survey; Lothair's constitution in fifteen, the *Imperialem*, in twenty-one.⁴⁸ The only doubt might concern the *De militum*, which only the gloss of *Wien* 2094 defines «hec lex est extravagans» but is not listed by Weimar.

Title P *Que sit forma sacramenti fidelitatis et qualiter debeat vasallus iurare*. *Lat.* 4064 makes only three references to two titles related to the oath of fealty: *Que sit forma sacramenti fidelitatis* (*Lat.* 4604, f. 66vb) and *Quod sit sacra(mentum) fidelis iura(ndum)* (*Lat.* 4604, f. 66va, 66vb). Title P includes six chapters from the *Decretum* which reached the second collection (P. 1-6 = Extr. III. 1, 2, 3, 8, 6, and 9 respectively); P. 1 is the mentioned letter of Fulbert of Chartres (*LF* II. 6 in the *vulgata*). P. 7 is the 'customary' feudal oath also included in the *vulgata* (= Extr. III. 29 = II. 7pr), whereas P. 8 is an unknown formula.⁴⁹ The first part of the heading of title P matches exactly the first of the two ancient titles mentioned in *Lat.* 4604, which may suggest, very tentatively, that Iacobus had at least part of the former – maybe the batch derived from the *Decretum* – already available at the time. The second of the titles mentioned in *Lat.* 4604 might refer to P. 8, as the similarity of the texts suggests.⁵⁰

Title Q *De pace tenenda*. *Lat.* 4604 contains references to all the twelve chapters that would constitute title Q. The first one is the mentioned constitution of Frederick I *De pace tenenda* (Q. 1 = Extr. IV. 14 = *LF* II. 27).⁵¹ Then, there are twenty-two references to another constitution

⁴⁷ The constitution *De militum* is probably attributable to Lothair III (1127): LOTHARIUS III, *Constitutiones*, M.G.H., *Leges* IV/1, p. 104.

⁴⁸ WEIMAR, *Die Handschriften*, cit. (footnote 7), p. 98.

⁴⁹ «Qui fidelitatem iurant, hoc modo iurant: “ego ero fidelis domino meo sicuti meo patri fidelis esse debeo. Ego non ero in consilio vel in facto ut perdat vitam vel rectum suum honorem. Et si quis contra fecerit, ego sibi providebo bona fide per me vel per meum nuncium. Et credencias quas michi commiserit salvas habebō sine fraude et malo ingenio. Sic Deus me adiuvet et hec Sancta Evangelia”. Et hoc prioribus dominis non existentibus. Si vero dominos anteriores habeat, dicet: “priorum dominorum fidelitate excepta et salva fidelitate imperatori”»: SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 95-96. See: **Appendix 2...**

⁵⁰ *Lat.* 4604 f. 66vb: «Et id quod sub debito fidelitatis ei commissum fuerit in credenciam ad dampnum domini non manifestabit ... infra Quod sit sacra(mentum) fidelis iura(ndum), in fine»; P. 8: «... credencias quas michi commiserit salvas habebō sine fraude et malo ingenio...».

⁵¹ Title *De pace tenenda* is mentioned nine times in *Lat.* 4604: § *Si vero pacis violator* in fi. (f. 58ra); § *Quicunque quibus* (f. 58ra); § *Si (i)res* (ff. 65va, 66va); § *Si interst.* (= *Si ministeriales*) (f. 65va); § *Si duo* (ff. 65vb, 66va); § *Miles rusticum* (f. 65vb); § *Si alium iudicem* (= *Si ministeriales*) (f. 66rb).

of Frederick I, the law *Hac edictali*, which reached the *vulgata* as *LF* II. 53-54; nonetheless, under the heading *Hac edictali* Iacobus cited three different sources. The first one is the original text of the constitution (Q. 2 = Extr. II. 15 = *LF* II. 53).⁵² The second one is a text that both *Lat. 4604* and title Q attached at the end of the *Hac edictali*, as it appears in the *vulgata* (Q. 3 = *LF* II. 54)⁵³ but that the second collection of Iacobus puts under a different title, Extr. II.26, still attributed to Frederick I. This element encourages some doubts on the authenticity of these paragraphs.⁵⁴ The last source cited under the heading *Hac edictali* (Q. 4-12) corresponds to *LF* II. 58, a collection of glosses known as *De notis feudorum*. Iacobus cited these chapters as if they were an integral part of the imperial constitution. E.g., paragraph *Notandum est*, the incipit of title *De notis feudorum* (Q. 4 = *LF* II. 58 pr.), appears as «in constitucione Frederici Hac edictali § Notandum est quod domini». It seems likely that Iacobus originally deemed this source as an extension of the imperial constitution, maybe meticulously following the text he was using, and realised the mistake only later. Indeed, his second collection has Q. 4-12 under title *De capitulis extraordinariis et alterius compilacionis feudorum* (Extr. I. 1-11). The analysis of title Q confirms that Iacobus began his work on the *Liber Ardigonis* on a version of the *Libri* which differed from the one of Pilius in that *LF* II. 27 was in the same place as in the other traditions of the *recensio ardigoniana*. Iacobus's choice to move it from the original position to a separate title among other imperial laws is all the more reasonable if one considers that the *De pace tenenda* in the *recensio ardigoniana* and the *vulgata* divides two batches (*LF* II. 25-26 and II. 28-51) which are entirely based on the Milanese judicial practice.

Title R. *Que sint regalie*. This title presents a striking singularity, for neither the manuscripts nor *Asti 1518* reports citations to the sources it encloses. It contains the chapter *Regalie*, which would eventually reach the *vulgata* (R. 1 = Extr. II. 27 = *LF* II. 56), and the three so-called 'lost laws' of Roncaglia (R. 2-4 = Extr. II. 28-30), which Frederick I enacted in 1158. It is likely that these four laws were originally transmitted as one batch, even though the last three were erased from the Accursian *recensio*. Vittore Colorni found a transcription of them in *Lat. 4677* just after the text of Iacobus's *summa*.⁵⁵ Although Iacobus never cited these sources in the *Summa*, he eventually moved them as one batch to his new collection (Extr. II. 27-30). The Pseudo-Revigny, in his mid-thirteenth-century *Summa feudorum*, cited the law *Omnis iurisdictio* under title

⁵² The seven references in *Lat. 4604* are: *i(nfra) Con(stitucione) Fre(derici) Hac edictali § Et si quis temerario* (55vb; 62vb, 67ra, 67ra); *§ Hac edictali lege in perpetuum valitura ut omnes* (56vb); *.I. resp(onso)* (66vb); *§ Iudices* (67ra).

⁵³ *Lat. 4604: in(fra) Con(stitucione) Fre(derici) Habere Consilia* [but Urgell 2042: *Hac edictali lege*] *§ Ut aequitas* (ff. 55va, 60rb).

⁵⁴ This second group is, according to Lehmann, a «falsatio in favorem ecclesie»: LEHMANN, *Das langobardische*, cit. (footnote 3), p. 179. See also FRIDERICUS I, *Constitutiones*, M.G.H., *Leges* IV/1, p. 247.

⁵⁵ COLORNI, *Le tre leggi*, cit. (footnote 38).

De regalibus (as in R. 2). Since he cited also titles from the second collection of Iacobus, it is very likely that he had to hand an extended version of the *Liber Ardiŕonis*.⁵⁶

Title S *De pace Constanciae*. In *Lat. 4604* there are eleven citations to the Peace of Constance (1183), which became title S of the *Liber Ardiŕonis*.⁵⁷ The text occurs as an *extravagans* in only two of the twenty-three mss surveyed by Weimar,⁵⁸ yet its broad circulation in the thirteenth century is undoubted.⁵⁹ In the second *Extravagantes* collection, it appears as dissected in several parts: Extr. II. 31 and Extr. III. 26-27. The Pseudo-Revigny cited this title as well.⁶⁰

5. For a chronology of Iacobus's early writings

The author of the glosses to *Wien 2094* suggested that the titles after S. *De pace Constanciae* were «alii tituli libri sui»,⁶¹ inducing Seckel to deem this title as the last one of the *Liber Ardiŕonis* and what followed as the *extravagantes* collection. However, considering that Iacobus wrote *summae* on the first four titles of this collection (**Table 1**), it is licit at least to think that he conceived them as an integral part of the *Liber Ardiŕonis*; all the more so, if one considers that he did not treat O'-S at all, once he had dissected its content in a wider and more systematic compilation. To clarify this passage, I try to put in order the chronology of Iacobus's early writings by comparing the new manuscript evidence with the studies on his life and other works.

In the 1220s, Iacobus owned a copy of the *recensio ardiŕoniana* containing several *extravagantes* and, soon after he returned from Bologna to Verona, used it as a reference to write a first draft of the *Summa*. Five elements, which have been used as proofs to determine the date of Iacobus's works, can be now re-examined: (1) the legal sources he used and cited. Then, three elements he mentioned in the *prooemium* of the *Summa*: (2) the death of his master

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 134. On the Pseudo-Revigny and the *Liber*: **Infra**, footnote 75 and chapter 8 (ppi).

⁵⁷ *Lat. 4604*: § *In caus(is) ap(pellacionum)* (55rb); § *Vasalli qui tempore* (56va, 59ra, 59va); § *Libellarie* (61va); § *In civitate illa* (65va); § *si qua controversia* (65va, 65va); § *Omnes de societate* (66vb); § *Consules* (67ra); § *Si qua vero civitatum* [by mistake under the *Hac edictali*] (67ra).

⁵⁸ WEIMAR, *Die Handschriften*, cit. (footnote 7), p. 98.

⁵⁹ G. DOLEZALEK, *Der Friede von Konstanz 1183 in der Literatur des "Jus Commune"*, in *Gli inizi del diritto pubblico*, 2, a cura di G. DILCHER, Bologna, 2009, pp. 277-307.

⁶⁰ COLORNI, *Le tre leggi*, cit. (footnote 38), pp. 134 f64.

⁶¹ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), p. 144.

Azo; (3) the death of his father; (4) the internal seditions of Verona. Eventually, (5) the date of Jean Blanc's return to Marseille.

1. I showed that Iacobus, at this stage, used legal sources dating before 1218, even though he wrote the treatise after the coronation of Frederick II (1220). In this draft, he cited his *summa De decurionibus* (*Lat. 4604*, f. 65va: «ut notavi in summa C(odicis) De decurio(nibus) § Sexto»). This treatise is usually dated as successive to 1233 since Iohannes from Vicenza appears as *podestà* of Verona, an office he fulfilled that year.⁶² Nonetheless, also the *De decurionibus* cites the *Summa feudorum*, making the entire argument circular. Evidently, Iacobus followed in this work the same *modus operandi* as in his feudal treatise, updating its content in different stages. Quite interestingly, the *De decurionibus* on the one hand refers to a paragraph which appears in both the first and later drafts of the *Summa feudorum*,⁶³ and on the other one cites, among some chapters of the *Libri*, the constitution *Fede(rici) Imperialem*⁶⁴ as an individual law. Iacobus included this law under O. 6 in his first collection and under Extr. II.24 in the second one. Thus, when he deemed the *De decurionibus* as complete, he had not compiled O'-S yet, and referred to the same copy of the *Libri* he utilised when he wrote the first draft of the *Summa*. This clue suggests that he concluded the *De decurionibus* in 1233-34, and that, at this stage, the collection O'-S was not finished yet.

⁶² LANGE, *Römisches*, cit. (footnote 15), p. 282. IACOBUS DE ARDIZONE, *Summa de decurionibus*, cit. (footnote 13), f. 447b: «Veruntamen ubi solus est aliquis qui debet eligere, licet Gadaldianus de Englariorum ac frater Ioannes Vicentinus super ducatu et potestaria Verone et Englarii contra fecerint (!)». *Englarium* corresponds to the modern Angiari, a village in the Veronese contado. On the *potestaria* of Iohannes see: *Syllabus potestatum Veronensium (1194-1305)*, in *Antiche cronache veronesi*, a cura di C. CIPOLLA, Venezia, 1890, p. 391. Gadaldianus de Angiari is probably a *miles*, vassal of the cathedral chapter of Verona, dead by 1222: E. MARINO, *Il Capitolo della cattedrale di Verona ad Angiari dall'alto medioevo agli Scaligeri: proprietà e signoria*, in *Angiari. Il territorio, la storia, il patrimonio artistico*, a cura di B. CHIAPPA, Angiari (VR), 1998, pp. 38-39.

⁶³ IACOBUS DE ARDIZONE, *Summa de decurionibus*, cit. (footnote 13), f. 449a: «Et ad hoc multa argumenta invenies in summa quam feci de feudis, in titulo De success(sione) feu(di) § Sed queritur an filius emancipatus»; this paragraph appears in *Lat. 4604*, f. 63rb.

⁶⁴ IACOBUS DE ARDIZONE, *Summa de decurionibus*, cit. (footnote 13), f. 446a: «Qualiter usus beneficii § Si vero fuerit contemptio; C. Qualiter in feu. § Inter dominum; C. Novum [non paternum] § Illud tamen, et in sequenti § Quaesitum; in ti(tulo) Hic incipit L. Coradi § .I. et .II., in Consti(tucione) Fede(rici) C. Imperialem § Ulti.».

2. The first version of the *Summa Feudorum* was written shortly after the author's studies in Bologna, where he attended the lessons of Azo, and, after his death, of Hugolinus Presbyteri. The general disagreement about the date of Azo's death – interpretations vary from 1220 to 1233 –, and the fact that recent studies use the dating of the *De decurionibus* and its citation to the *Summa* as a source to determine it⁶⁵ convinced me to discard this argument as potentially circular.

3. Iacobus remembered in the *prooemium* his father Ardizo 'de Broilo', in commemoration and honour of whom he used the signature «AR.». He then added that «one shall bring honour to the living as well as to the dead».⁶⁶ Therefore, Ardizo was already dead when Iacobus finished the *Summa*. The *terminus post quem* for the completion of this first *summa* would consequently be between January 1226 – the last appearance of Ardizo as alive – and January 1230, when he is mentioned as already deceased.⁶⁷

4. In the *prooemium*, Iacobus also wrote that he completed his «*summula*» in the «destructibile tempus» of the internal subversion of the once great Verona. On this point, neither Laspeyres nor Varanini was correct. First of all, Laspeyres was not aware of the earlier traditions of the *Summa*, which Iacobus probably concluded before 1233 and in which he already mentioned the Veronese internal wars. Therefore, Iacobus could not refer to 1234-40, as Laspeyres suggested; nor could he refer to the 1250s, as Varanini thought.⁶⁸ It is likely that Iacobus had in mind the time of the exhausting wars which opposed the urban factions since the last months of 1225. This conflict underwent a series of violent outbreaks until

⁶⁵ E. CONTE, L. LOSCHIAVO, *Azzone*, in *Dizionario biografico dei giuristi Italiani (XII-XX secolo)*, I, a cura di I. BIROCCHI, E. CORTESE, A. MATTONE, M.N. MILETTI, Bologna, 2013, pp. 137-139; N. SARTI, *Sull'identità del 'dominus Iacobus qui Ianuae in equo armatus tulit sententiam'. Intorno a una nuova fonte*, in *Rivista di Storia del Diritto Italiano*, 62 (1989), pp. 363-382.

⁶⁶ *Lat. 4604*, f. 55ra: «Mihi Iacobo de domino Ardeçone de Broilo, a quo origine sumpsi (...) ad cuius commemorationem et honorem signum AR glosulis meis et sumulis apposui, persona cuius mihi semper honesta ac sancta debet apparere (...) cui tam vivo quam mortuo debet honor exhiberi».

⁶⁷ Varanini suggests that Ardizo died in an unknown date between 1225 and 1230: VARANINI, *Iacopo di Ardigzone*, cit. (footnote 16), p. 259. I found more detailed evidence in CITTÀ DEL VATICANO, Archivum Secretum Vaticanum, Fondo Veneto I, perg. 9205 (23 January 1226), and 9433 (15 January 1230): the latter was drafted in the «domus domini Iacobi causidici et suorum fratrum filii quondam domini Ardicionis cambiatoris».

⁶⁸ *Supra*, footnotes 11-13 and 17-20 and the corresponding text.

1236, with the stabilisation under Ezzelino's government and the ultimate defeat of the marquises d'Este. The series of political upheavals between 1225 and 1236 – and later⁶⁹ – prove that, in the eyes of Iacobus, who perceived himself as *super partes* and put effort in the pacification process, any year could fit the generic description «seditio intrinseca».

5. Laspeyres believed the *Summa* to be completed before Jean Blanc came back to Marseille, in 1240, a date which Giordanengo proved to be 1237.⁷⁰ This date may match, as we will see, some of the later version of the treatise. However, Jean Blanc knew Iacobus was dead when he concluded his feudal law opus, an element which dates its conclusion after 1254.⁷¹ It is well possible that Jean Blanc received an updated copy of the *Summa* after 1237. After all, it had a good circulation, as the diffusion of early fourteenth-century copies proves, and was known and glossed by other French scholars such as Jacques d'Orleans.

Now that I have pondered the elements traditionally used to date the *Summa*, it is possible to propose a hypothesis which take into account the development of Iacobus's writings. In the later versions of the treatise, Iacobus admitted to having written his *opus* «suddenly» after the end of his studies in Bologna: «ab eisdem [Azo and Hugolinus] collectis hincinde argumentis [...] repente visum fuit mihi utile summulam [...] componere» (*Wien 2094*, f. 29rb). The term «repente» does not occur in the early versions – *Lat. 4604*, *Urgell 2402*,

⁶⁹ On the attempt of reconciliation in June 1230: G.M. VARANINI, *Primi contributi alla storia della classe dirigente veronese del Duecento. Un documento del giugno 1230*, in *Viridarium floridum. Studi di storia veneta offerta dagli allievi a Paolo Sambin*, a cura di M.C. BILLANOVICH, G. CRACCO, A. RIGON, Padova, 1984, pp. 191-228. Until then the war had been continuous: Ezzelino da Romano took over Verona in the last months of 1225, exiling all his political opponents, followers of the counts San Bonifacio and the marquises d'Este. In 1228, the Lombard League imposed a government of members of both factions, whose last act was the mentioned pacification in 1230, which failed. Indeed, that year Ezzelino took the city by force, imprisoning his rival Count Rizzardo; in 1231, the League freed Rizzardo and imposed an external rector, soon expelled (1232) by Ezzelino, who had gained the support of Emperor Frederick II. In 1233, the Dominican preacher Iohannes from Vicenza, counting on a large popular consensus – people were evidently exhausted of the endless wars – was elected *podestà* of Verona and tried to reconcile – without success – the two factions. For two years, Verona, even though under Ezzelino's control, was governed alternatively by rectors of the League and imperial legates. Only in 1236, with the support of Frederick II, Ezzelino took over the city, which he ruled, directly or not, until his death, in 1259: SIMEONI, *Il comune veronese*, cit. (footnote 11); VARANINI, *Il comune di Verona*, cit. (footnote 18).

⁷⁰ *Supra*, footnotes 14-15 and matching text.

⁷¹ JEAN BLANC, *Epitome iuris feudorum*, Coloniae, 1565, f. 90: «Iacobus de Ardizone, compositor alterius summae feudorum, sed salva eius reverentia et pace». See: GIORDANENGO, *Jean Blanc*, cit. (footnote 15).

Madrid 577, and, as we will see, *Lat. 4677*. In other words, he would remember only some years later of this decision as «sudden». Thus, he must have begun to write not too shortly after his return to Verona, which seemingly occurred in 1228. The year after, he was *iudex appellacionum*, an office he cited in the first draft of the *Summa*: «vel etiam a sententia alicuius appellando, cum et quandoque iudex appellacionis in deterius proferat sententiam».⁷²

Another passage of the first draft reports that Iacobus concluded it in a moment of separation from the administrative and political life of the city, relieved from any other task, «aliis sollicitudinis destitutus». In light of the new archival evidence, the likeliest hypothesis is that he completed this early version during a period of absence from the documentation successive to 1229. The only possible time span is between June 1230, when he took part in a failed attempt to pacify the opposing factions, and February 1233, when, after almost three years, he reappears in the records, now the leader of his family.⁷³ Even though the reasons of this eclipse are not clear – they could simply be an archival casualty – from then on Iacobus occurs in the records regularly, and there is no other plausible period of separation from public life. Be it as it may, whether in Verona or somewhere else, Iacobus must have started writing the first draft around 1229 and completed the version transmitted in *Lat. 4604* by 1233 or 1234. This *terminus* matches the fact that in that period he was seemingly concluding the *De decurionibus*, but the collection O'-S was not compiled yet.

6. The evolution of the *Summa* and the second *Extravagantes* collection

After the completion of O'-S, arguably around 1234 or shortly after, Iacobus began the systematisation of a massive corpus of sources in a new *extravagantes* collection. We have seen that *Wien 2094* is the only available source for its tradition and transmits it in two forms: as the last four titles in the index of the *Liber Ardiŕonis* (T-Y), which match the first four titles (Extr. I-IV) of a wider collection (Extr. I-XV). As *Asti 1518* cites only part of this material, Seckel believed Iacobus to be the compiler of just Extr. I-V, VI. 1-2, and VII. 2 (**Tab. 2**),

⁷² Citation from: *Urgell 2042* f. 89ra. *Lat. 4604*, f. 55ra is illegible because of a large stain of humidity.

⁷³ CITTÀ DEL VATICANO, Fondo Veneto I, perg. 9524: 4 February 1233, Verona *in civitate in hora S. Cecilie in domo dominorum Iacobi causidici, domini Carlaxarii, Nasscinbene et Omneboni fratrum filiorum q. domini Ardiŕonis*.

excluding thus from further analysis Extr. VIII-XV.⁷⁴ New interesting evidence on this collection came from the *Summa feudorum* of the Pseudo-Revigny, apparently written towards 1250⁷⁵ and whose apparatus refers to five titles of Iacobus's *extravagantes* collections, plus one whose tradition is also related to Iacobus.⁷⁶ These citations provide an interesting insight on the early diffusion of the *Liber Ardizonis* and confirm its deep entanglement with the writing of the *Summa*, whose analysis is now necessary to understand the development of the former.

First of all, I need to clarify that the rubrication of the printed edition does not reflect the distribution of the text, and is in fact quite misleading. The *summae* to the first two titles include 135 rubrics out of a total of 153 (88%) whereas they cover only 58% of the text; the last titles, on the other hand, are considerably longer.⁷⁷ As the rubrication of the printed editions is no reliable indicator for the structural analysis of the *Summa*, I will follow the subdivision described in column three and four of **Table 1**. As the tradition of the second *extravagantes* collection is quite complex, to avoid possible confusion, I use expressions such as SF T to refer to the *summa* to title T, SF U for the *summa* to title U, and so on. When I refer to the matching titles of the *Liber Ardizonis*, I stick to Seckel's nomenclature: Extr. I (= T), II (= U), III (= X), IV (= Y).

The treatise is a collection of *summae* to every title of the *Libri* – and then, in its later versions, of the *Liber Ardizonis*. The structure of the latter, thus, shaped the structure of the

⁷⁴ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 115-129.

⁷⁵ Pecorella attributed this treatise to Jacques de Revigny: IACOBUS DE RAVANIS, *Summa feudorum*, a cura di C. PECORELLA, Milano 1959 [1st ed. 1957]. Robert Feenstra convincingly rejected this hypothesis in R. FEENSTRA, review of C. Pecorella, *Jacobus de Ravanis. Summa feudorum*, in *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis*, 25 (1957), pp. 411-416. Kees Bezemer attributes this treatise to Iacobus Balduini, who died in 1235, and suggests that the occurrence of later sources is due to an updating carried out by Balduini's pupils: K. BEZEMER, *Jacobus Balduini: probably the author of the Summa feudorum Parmensis*, in *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis*, 74/3-4 (2006), pp. 325-335.

⁷⁶ *Quae sint regalia* (= title R); *De pace Consantiae* (= title S); *De capitulis extraordinariis* (= title T = Extr. I), *De feudis et beneficiis constitutiones imperiales* (= title U = Extr. II), *De privilegiis ecclesiarum et quarundam personarum* (= title Extr. VI). The last title is *De quibusdam aliis capitulis extraordinariis de feudis*: COLORNI, *Le tre leggi, Le tre leggi*, cit. (footnote 38), pp. 134-136. On its attribution, see **Infra, chapter 7 (pp...)**

⁷⁷ SF A corresponds to SF 1-54 in *Asti 1518* (ff. 3ra-11va); SF B to SF 55-135 (ff. 11va-25rb). SF C (f. 25rb) is relatively short, but SF D (ff. 25rb-30va) covers twenty-one columns of text, corresponding to only one rubric. SF E (ff. 30vb-32vb) covers nine columns, again under only one rubric. On average, every rubric of SF A covers just 0.64 columns (35 columns, 54 rubrics); SF B: 0.71 columns per rubric (58 to 81).

former. However, since some titles of the *Liber* dealt with similar topics – such as title D. *De successione feudi* and title O. *Qui debeant succedere in feudo*, both treating the succession to fiefs – Iacobus would discuss the matter only in its first occurrence. Thus, *SF* D consists of an extensive discussion, whereas *SF* O contains just a brief reference to the first one. This *modus operandi* entails an evident disproportion in the distribution of the text, which is considerably larger in the first sections of the opus. According to this methodology, Iacobus devoted extensive treatment to just seven titles of the first thirteen titles – excluded thus the sections after O’, which I discuss separately. The subjects he treated are respectively: a fief’s acquisition (A), loss (B), nature (C), succession (D), and litigation (E), the feudal oath (J) and the distinction between new and ancient fiefs (K). *SF* F (*Qualiter usus beneficii sit tenendus*) consists of a short paragraph referring to *SF* A and B.⁷⁸ In a similar way, *SF* G and M are just references to *SF* E (*De contentione feudi*), whereas the *SF* L and O are brief references to *SF* B and D respectively. Furthermore, title H (*De cognitione feudi*) was not discussed, for what Iacobus had to say said of the *cognitio feudi* «was already dealt with in all the previous sections».⁷⁹ Title N (*Hic incipiunt consuetudines regni*), eventually, «non est summandum per se, cum omnes precedentes et sequentes possunt dici consuetudines regni».⁸⁰

After *SF* A-O, Iacobus decided to not discuss at all titles O’-S, which he must have deemed as obsolete once he concluded his second collection, and jumped directly to the *summae* to titles T-Y (= Extr. I-IV). The absence of treatment of three out of four titles (Extr. I-III), and, more importantly, the occurrence of the same text in both *SF* T and Extr. I, induced Seckel to believe this section of the *Summa* to be a reproduction of the titles of the *extravagantes* collection; scribes would thus omit from their copy of the *Summa* the text they

⁷⁸ *Asti* 1518, f. 32vb: «Supra dictum est quibus modis feudum acquisitum amittatur. Nunc videndum est qualiter usus beneficii sit tenendus. Sed quia scimus per id quod notatum est supra ti. *Quibus modis feu. acqui.* et acquisitum amittatur, per consequentiam scire possumus quibus modis feudum acquisitum retineatur. Unde ad praesens omitto nam scito uno contrariorum, scitur et relinquitur...»

⁷⁹ *Asti* 1518, f. 33ra: «id quod in eo titulo continetur satis in superioribus summis comprehenditur».

⁸⁰ *Asti* 1518, f. 34vb-35ra.

had already available in the other collection.⁸¹ Therefore, we need to inquire the relation between Extr. I-II and *SF* T-U.

Asti 1518 reports as *SF* T (*De capitulis extraordinariis et alterius compilacionis feudorum*: ff. 35ra-35va) some chapters which also appear in the *Extravagantes* collection of *Wien 2094*, under the homonymous title (Extr. I. 23-54). However, under *SF* U (*De feudis et beneficiis constitutiones...*) the same edition reports other chapters which do not occur in *Wien 2094*.⁸² Karl Lehmann accepted Iacobus's authorship and included the two batches in the *Capitula extraordinaria Iacobi de Ardizzone* as an appendix to his edition of the *Libri Feudorum*.⁸³ Seckel was of a different opinion: he saw in title T's repetition the scribe's deliberate choice to report in the *Summa* the text he had available in his copy of the *Liber*, but since the chapters of *SF* U do not occur in the collection of *Wien 2094*, Seckel deemed them as spurious. He believed the *SF* T, U, and X to be extraneous to the rest of the treatise.⁸⁴ On the contrary, Iacobus was utilising here the same methodology as in the previous titles, and no clues point to the fact that Iacobus conceived of *SF* T-Y in a different way.⁸⁵ I will try to substantiate this point by reassessing the tradition of the *Capitula extraordinaria Iacobi de Ardizzone* edited by Lehmann, through the analysis of three post-1234 traditions: *Lat. 4677*, *Lat. 16008*, and *Parma 1227*.⁸⁶

7. Titles Extr. I-II and the *Capitula Extraordinaria Iacobi de Ardizzone*

⁸¹ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 115-129; COLORNI, *Le tre leggi*, cit. (footnote 38), p. 125, convinced of Seckel's point, sought in *SF* T-U the texts of Extr. I-II, and confirmed that text of the *Summa* must be incomplete and not genuine.

⁸² *Asti 1518*, ff. 35vb-36va.

⁸³ LEHMANN, *Langobardische*, cit. (footnote 3), pp. 186-198.

⁸⁴ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 153-160.

⁸⁵ The only part which is not technically a *summa* of a title of the *Liber* is title *De poenis inferendis* – which Iacobus indeed introduced as chapters «extra hanc summam notandis» (*Asti 1518*, f. 40va).

⁸⁶ I could not analyse manuscripts *El Escorial E.I.10* and *Napoli III.A.32*. It consoles me the fact that Lehmann suggested that the Neapolitan manuscript does not contain any relevant evidence on the *extravagantes*: LEHMANN, *Langobardische*, cit. (footnote 3), p. 44. Colorni suggests the same about the ms *El Escorial*: COLORNI, *Le tre leggi*, cit. (footnote 38), p. 140.

The heading of Extr. I is *De capitulis extraordinariis et alterius compilacionis feudorum* (**App. 2**).⁸⁷ Its first batch is the so-called *De notis feudorum* (Extr. I. 1-11 = *LF* II. 58), which Iacobus had collected under the constitution *Hac edictali* (title Q. 4-12) but now deemed as «capitula extraordinaria» – i.e. the first part of the heading. The remaining chapters (Extr. I. 12-54) constituted an independent treatise, an «altera compilacio feudorum», as the second part of the heading reports. A glossator of *Lat. 4677* annotated the phrase «in veteri compilacione» in the margin of any occurrence of these chapters.⁸⁸ However, *Asti 1518* reports only part of them (Extr. I. 23-54 as *SF T* §§ 1-26), so that it is possible that Extr. I. 12-22 had also circulated independently. Lehmann, who understood the value of this material but did not know the collection of *Wien 2094*, derived this corpus from the *Libellus Reformatus* (c. 1440) of Bartholomeus Baraterius and published it as the *Capitula extraordinaria Baraterii*.⁸⁹ He then derived from *Asti 1518* the other batch (*SF T* §§ 1-26) and published it as the first part of the *Capitula extraordinaria Iacobi de Ardizone*.⁹⁰ To sum up, Iacobus had to hand two ancient compilations, which he inserted in Extr. I as one «altera compilacio» under Extr. I. 12-22 and 23-54 respectively; the scribe of the lost antigraph of *Asti 1518*, according to Seckel, transcribed under *SF T* §§ 1-26 only the second corpus, which he must have found in a copy of the *extravagantes* collection. From this tradition, Lehmann derived the first section of the *Capitula extraordinaria Iacobi* (1-27).

[Insert Tab. 2]

Furthermore, Lehmann inserted in the *capitula Iacobi* another twenty-six chapters (*C. extr. Iac.* 28-53) which he derived from *Asti 1518*, *SF U.* 1-27 (ff. 35ra-35vb) (**Tab. 2**). Except for the first chapter, the constitution *De militum* which figures in both *extravagantes* collections (O.5 = Extr. II. 33), Seckel deemed this corpus as not genuine for at least three reasons. (1) Iacobus never cited these chapters in his *Summa*. (2) There are substantial inconsistencies

⁸⁷ See **Appendix 2**. In the index of the *Compilacio*, title T is only slightly different: *De variis et extra ordinem capitulis et alterius compilacionis feudorum* (*Wien 2094*, f. 72rc).

⁸⁸ One of the glossators of *Lat. 4677* reports this expression in the margin of all chapters from Extr. I. 12 (f. 20rb) to Extr. I. 54 (ff. 36rb, 36va).

⁸⁹ LEHMANN, *Langobardische*, cit. (footnote 3), pp. 199-200.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 186-192.

between some of these chapters and some passages of the treatise. (3) The content of *SF U* §§ 2-26 does not match the heading and conclusion of the title, where it is stated that it contains «de feudis et beneficiis constitutiones regales et imperiales et decreta(les) et statuta». On the contrary, Seckel concluded, it presents numerous fragments of «private laws» more appropriate to the previous *SF T*.⁹¹

As for the first point, Seckel himself showed that Iacobus cited these chapters with the formula he used to quote the *Liber Ardigonis* – «i(nfra) Cap(itulis) Extr(aordinariis)» – and not the *Summa* – «ut notavi/notatur i(nfra)/s(upra)». Seckel was confident that the text of the *summa* after title O was a repetition of the matching texts in the *Liber*. However, if one does not take this equivalence as a given fact, it makes perfectly sense that Iacobus might have added *SF U*. 2-26 only to the *Summa* because he did not do so, yet, in the *Liber*. As for the second point, one ought not to overestimate contradictions as substantial proof, for the addition of material, did not follow any logic of consistency, but simply aimed at collecting any available source even remotely related to feudal matters.

The third point, stressing that *SF U* should contain only laws, decretals and statutes, is the one best made. To Seckel's legitimate doubts, I may add that the Pseudo-Revigny cites *SF U*. 2-8 as title *De quibusdam aliis capitulis extraordinariis de feudis*,⁹² which constitutes the vast majority of what Seckel deemed as private laws. By 1250, therefore, these chapters had become an independent title, recalling title T *De capitulis extraordinariis*. **Table 2** shows that *SF U*. 2-8 occur in *Asti 1518* between two imperial laws; the rest of the title contains fourteen extracts from the *Decretum* (*SF U*. 12-16 and 18-26) and three titles of unknown origin (*SF U*. 10, 11, and 17). Of them, the first seems a *consilium* (§ 10, *Quaesitum scio*) and the third is almost certainly a gloss.⁹³ On the other hand, title Extr. II contains fifty-seven chapters, among royal-imperial constitutions and papal decretals from the *Lombarda* (Extr. II. 1-18),

⁹¹ Seckel knew that Iacobus Alvarottus, in his *Lectura feudi*, reported these chapters as *collecta per dominum Jacobum Ardigonis*, but he also stressed that Baldus de Ubaldis had cast doubts on their authenticity. He concluded that Alvarottus possessed a manuscript very similar to the antigraph of *Asti 1518*. The argumentations are in: SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 153-160.

⁹² COLORNI, *Le tre leggi*, cit. (footnote 38), pp. 134-36.

⁹³ *Asti 1518*, f. 36rb: «Nulla iuris constitutione aut consuetudinis ususque longaevis observantia prohiberi suscitato invenio, vasallum arctiori, quam in se habeat, lege feudum in alium ubilibet posse transferre».

extravagantes laws (Extr. II. 19-33), and Canon law compilations (Extr. II. 34-57), plus some chapters from the Veronese statutes which do not occur in *Wien 2094*.⁹⁴ In the light of such composition, the reservations of Seckel are perfectly understandable, and only a closer look at the manuscript tradition can remove doubts on the matter.

In *Lat. 4677*, there is no *SF T* at all. In *Lat. 16008* (f. 51vb) and *Parma 1227* (f. 49ra) the title consists of one sentence:

Hoc respectu tituli non potest summari, sed capitula extravagantia et alterius compilationis que non erant in supradicta compilatione *hic* ponuntur ut allegari possint sub certo titulo.

«Hic» in this case seems to mean «in the respective title of the *Liber*» rather than «here in the *summa*», and indeed this title «non potest summari». The way Iacobus treated this title is not so different from what he did with *SF F*, G, H, L, M, N, and O, all consisting of brief statements justifying the absence of dissertation. This hypothesis is confirmed by the extensive *summa* to title *De pace tenenda* (*SF Y: Asti 1518*, ff. 36va-40va) (**Tab. 1**). One possibility is that *SF T* and U worked as containers where Iacobus gathered material which he would later codify in the *Liber Ardigonis* – this might be the relation between Extr. I. 23-54 under *SF T*. 1-26. The insertion of new titles under *SF U*. 2-26 might be much less surprising than Seckel suggested.

The heading of *SF U* – *De feudis et beneficiis constitutiones regales, imperiales, decretales, statuta communis Ver(one)* – confirms that Iacobus collected in Extr. II legal material produced by what he deemed as public authorities – kings, emperors, popes, and the city-commune. He added that some of these chapters did not occur in any code (Extr. II. 20-33); some others were already collected under titles, but dispersed in various *loci*: the Lombarda (Extr. II. 1-18), Canon law compilations (Extr. II. 34-57), and the statutory code of Verona.⁹⁵ In the three manuscript traditions, the title consists only of these succinct considerations about the chapter contained in the matching title of the *Liber*.⁹⁶ In *Asti 1518*, however, *SF U* reports

⁹⁴ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 123-128; A. STELLA, *La Summa feudorum e la consuetudo Veronensis*, in VARANINI, STELLA, *Scenari veronesi*, op. cit. (footnote 16), pp. 266-269 and 278.

⁹⁵ Ibidem. See also **Infra**, text corresponding to footnotes 102-105.

⁹⁶ *SF U*: «§ De feudis et beneficiis constitutiones regales, imperiales, decretales, statuta communis Ver(one). Hec non sumatur sed cum leges, decretales, et statuta super feudis essent extravagancia, et quedam

an abbreviated heading (*De feudis et beneficiis constitutiones imperiales*), the controverted §§ 1-26, and a closing paragraph which is different from the text of the manuscripts in that it substitutes the expression «these chapters» with «the above-written chapters».⁹⁷ The text was thus altered to fit the insertion of §§ 1-26, either by Iacobus himself or by someone who felt entitled to modify the text. However, the circulation of *SF* U. 2-8 as an independent title *De quibusdam aliis capitulis extraordinariis de feudis* together with the other titles of the *Liber* cited by the Pseudo-Revigny, makes very likely my hypothesis that Iacobus was the compiler of the additions of *SF* U. 1-26. If I am right, all the *Capitula Iacobi* of Lehmann's edition would be genuine.

8. The *Extravagantes* Collection I-XV. Composition and attribution

Now that I have dealt with its most problematic passages and confirmed that Iacobus deemed of at least Extr. I-IV as an integral part of the *Liber Ardiŕonis*, I can briefly describe Extr. I-XV, of which I offer an outline in **Appendix 2**.

Extr. I. *De capitulis extraordinariis et alterius compilacionis feudorum*, consisted of two batches. (1) *De notis feudorum* (Extr. I. 1-11 = *LF* II.58) – also referred to as *Capitula Extraordinaria* – and (2) the so-called «altera compilacio feudorum» (I. 12-54) or «vetus compilacio» according to the glossator of *Lat.* 4677. As to the second corpus, we have seen that it probably circulated in two parts (II. 12-22 and 23-54), which Lehmann published respectively as the *Capitula extraordinaria Baraterii* and *Capitula extraordinaria Iacobi de Ardiŕone*. The pseudo-Revigny knew this title, from which he cited only chapters of the *De notis feudorum*.⁹⁸

Extr. II. This title figures as *De feudis et beneficiis* in the index of the *Compilacio*, and as *De feudis et beneficiis constitutiones regales, imperiales, et decretales* in the *Extravagantes* collection. *Wien 2094* describes fifty-seven among royal and imperial constitutions and papal decretals, derived in

sine titulis, et quedam cum titulis sed in diversis locis sparsa, visum fuit utile ponere sub titulo, ut per titulum certum possint allegari». *SF* X «§ De sacramento et forma fidelitatis et eius remissione. Rubrica. Pro summa huius tituli sufficiat alia summa similis huic s(upra) qualiter iurare debeat vasallus, ut quod ibi notatur, hic repetatur»: *Lat.* 4677, f. 47vb. These texts occur with negligible differences in *Parma 1227* (f. 49ra) and *Lat.* 16008 (f. 51vb).

⁹⁷ *Asti 1518*, ff. 35vb-36ra: [*SF* U] «§ De feudis et constitutiones imperiales. [...] Superscripta capitula [§§ 1-26] non summantur sed cum leges et decretales et statuta super feudis essent extravagantia, et quaedam sine titulis, sed in diversis locis sparsa: fuit visum utile ponere sub titulo ut per titulum certum possint allegari».

⁹⁸ COLORNI, *Le tre leggi*, cit. (footnote 38), p. 134.

part from the *Lombarda* (Extr. II. 1-18), in part from Canon law compilations (Extr. II. 34-57), and in part from *extravagantes*, extracts from other laws, or other traditions (Extr. II. 19-33). Quite oddly, Extr. II. 19 reproduces Lothair III's law already present in LF I. 19-24;⁹⁹ Extr. II. 25 reports three paragraphs of the *De pace tenenda* (Extr. IV. 14 = Q. 1 = LF II. 27). With minor variations, *Lat. 4677* (f. 47vb), *Lat. 16008* (f. 51vb), and *Parma 1227* (f. 49ra) report this title as *De feudis et beneficiis constitutiones regales, imperiales, decretales, statuta comunis Verone*. *Asti 1518* omits the part «decretales, statuta comunis Verone» (f. 35vb). Thus, the title was originally subdivided into three parts: (1) the *constitutiones regales et imperiales*, (2) the *decretales*, and (3) the *statuta communis Veronae*. The Pseudo-Revigny cites only chapters of the first section (Extr. II. 2, 4, 8, 15, 26). *Wien 2094* transmits the first two sections, respectively in Extr. II. 1-33 and 34-57, seven chapters of which reached the *vulgata*.¹⁰⁰ Extr. II. 57 derives from the *Liber Extra* (X. 5.1.27), an element that dates the title to after 1234. *Asti 1518* contains thirty-eight references to sixteen titles of the municipal laws of Verona, which were nonetheless omitted by later scribes. At least twelve of these citations are rendered as *constit(utio)* instead of *in stat(uta)*, causing confusion on the source.¹⁰¹ Chapter *Nulla capto viat(ore)*, which does not appear in the Veronese statutes, derives from an incorrect reading of *Mulctabo viatorem*. This text proves that Iacobus relied on a version of the statutes successive to the one issued in 1228:¹⁰² the author evokes it to punish the *falsa ambaxata*, a crime for which only the municipal code of 1276 made provision.¹⁰³ The citation of the unknown chapter *Et qui aliquem* must belong to the same intermediate version of the statutes.¹⁰⁴ With these additions, Extr. II is the widest title of the *Liber Ardigonis*, containing at least seventy-six chapters.

Extr. III: *De forma et sacramento fidelitatis et eius remissione*. The heading of this title appears in an abbreviated form in the index of the *Compilacio* (X. *De forma et sacramento fidelitatis*). In the *Summa*, the corresponding title consists of just a reference to title J: «Pro summa huius tituli sufficiat alia summa similis huic s(upra) *Qualiter iurare debeat vasallus*, ut quod ibi notatur, hic repetatur» (*SF X*, *Asti 1518*, f. 36va). It includes twenty-nine chapters on the oath of fealty, mostly taken

⁹⁹ Supra, footnote 33.

¹⁰⁰ See Appendix 2, p. ---

¹⁰¹ STELLA, *La Summa feudorum*, cit. (footnote 95), p. 278.

¹⁰² *Liber iuris civilis urbis Veronae*, ed. by BARTOLOMEO CAMPAGNOLA;

¹⁰³ *Lat. 4677*, f. 54vb: «Item viator Ver(one) bullari debet in fronte si falsam ambaxatam fecerit, ut in Statutis Ver(one), C(apitulo) mulctabo viatorem»; the title of the 1228 statute is in: *Liber iuris civilis urbis Veronae*, per B. CAMPAGNOLAM, Veronae, 1728, pp. 189-90. The chapter from the 1276 statute is in: VERONA, Biblioteca Civica, ms. 3037 cit., III, cap CXXXII, De viatoris mulctandis, c. 323. See also: P. LÜTKE WESTHUES, *Die Kommunalstatuten von Verona im 13. Jahrhundert. Formen und Funktionen von Recht und Schrift in einer oberitalienischen Kommune*, Frankfurt am Main, 1995.

¹⁰⁴ *Asti 1518*, f. 39rb: «Ut in statuto Verone, ubi dicitur: et qui aliquem vel aliquos receperit suo mandato pro iniuria seu damno dato ei, et infra annum negocium non diffiniet vel diffiniri faciet, non possit nec debeat eum gravare, sed ipso iure ab illa oblicatione facta sit absolutus; ut in eo(dem) statuto, c(apitulo) Et qui aliquem».

from Canon law compilations (Extr. III. 1-23). The remaining material consists of a chapter from the *Authenticum* (Extr. III. 24), three extracts from imperial laws (Extr. III. 25-27), and two ‘customary’ texts (Extr. III. 28-29). Some chapters had been part of title P, such as Extr. III. 1 (the *Epistola Philiberti*) and III. 29 («Est et alia»), which reached the *vulgata* as LF II. 6 and II. 7pr. Since Iacobus derived Extr. III. 17 from the *Liber Extra* (5. 7. 16), the completion of this title is successive to 1234. The Pseudo-Revigny did not cite this title.

Extr. IV: *De pace et treuga (!) tenenda et componenda*. The same title occurs in the index of *Wien 2094*. Iacobus dedicated a full dissertation to Extr. IV already in the early versions of the *Summa* (*SF Y, Asti 1518*, ff. 36va-40va). Its twenty-two chapters derive from the *Lombarda* (Extr. IV. 1-13), imperial laws (IV. 14-16 and 21-22), Canon law (IV. 17-19), the *Tres Libri* (IV. 20). Iacobus included here some of the material he had collected in title Q and would then reach the *vulgata*: the *De pace tenenda* (Extr. IV. 14 = Q. 1 = LF II. 27), and the constitution *Hac edictali* (Extr. IV. 15 = LF II. 53-54). No citations of this title result in the Pseudo-Revigny.

Extr. V, *De privilegio scholastico*, includes the renowned privilege which Frederick I issued around 1155. Even though the law had reached the *Authenticum*, Iacobus cited it in his early works as the *con(stitutio) Fre(derici) Habita super hoc* (*Lat. 4604*, f. 55ra), and in the later versions as title Extr. V: «infra De privil(egio) schol(astico), l(ege) Habita super» (*Wien 2094*, f. 29rb; *Asti 1518*, f. 3ra). *Lat. 4677*, which contains references to Extr. I-IV and VI, ignores the existence of Extr. V and maintains the same form as the earlier versions¹⁰⁵. It is therefore very likely that Extr. V was compiled after Extr. VI.

Extr. VI: *De priv(i)leg(iis) ecclesiarum et quarundam humilium personarum, et de hereticis et fautoribus, et de naufragis et peregrinis, rubrica*. **Extr. VII:** *De pena iudicum male indicantium*. In the *extravagantes* collection, these titles include respectively five and two constitutions of Emperor Frederick II. Iacobus’s *Summa* contain references only to Extr. VI. 1-2. Extr. VI.1 is the coronation act of 1220. Seckel showed that VI. 2-3 and VII. 2 belong to a tradition dating at the latest to 1231, whereas VI. 4-5 and VII. 1 were issued in Padua in 1239. Consequently, he attributed to Iacobus Extr. VI.1-3 and VII. 2, and to an unknown compiler, active after 1239, the remaining chapters. With these chapters, according to Seckel, ends the *extravagantes* collection originally compiled by Iacobus. Pseudo-Revigny cites Extr. VI. 1, 2, and 5, probably referring to a version of the *Liber Ardissonis* successive to 1239.¹⁰⁶

Extr. VIII-XV are the so-called *capitula addita*. Seckel attributed the corpus to a later compiler, who collected this ‘customary’ material dealing only to a little extent with feudal matters. These titles treat at horse services (Extr. VIII), hunting rights (Extr. IX-X), agistment pacts (Extr. XI-XIV) and agrarian contracts (Extr. XV). Seckel admitted that only the analysis of the content of these chapters would solve the matter definitively; he also described a tradition of Extr. XI-XIV through the *Tractatus de societate et soccida* of the fifteenth-century jurist Angelo

¹⁰⁵ *Urgell 2402*, f. 89ra; *Madrid 577*, f. 117ra.

¹⁰⁶ COLORNI, *Le tre leggi*, cit. (footnote 38), pp. 134-135.

Perigli († 1447), professor in Padua and Perugia. Perigli derived these *iura quedam extravagantia* as part of the *extraordinaria capitula feudorum*, i.e. at the end of the *Libri* in his copy of the *Corpus iuris civilis*.¹⁰⁷ Seckel assessed this corpus as Italian and dated it to the thirteenth century; his rejection of Iacobus's authorship rests on three points: (1) in *Wien 2094*, titles Extr. VIII-XV are the only ones not glossed; (2) Iacobus does not cite them in his *Summa*; (3) the connection to feudal law is fragile in Extr. VIII and does not subsist in the other titles.

9. The development of the *Liber Ardizonis*

It is possible to add just slight reassessments to Seckel's philological analysis in light of the diachronic development of Iacobus's writings. Iacobus completed an early version of the *Summa* – as we see it in *Lat. 4604*, *Urgell 2402* and *Madrid 577* – probably around 1233, and worked on the collection O'-S since around 1234. Afterwards, he gathered together a vast collection of sources which he systematised in his new *Extravagantes* collection. Every manuscript tradition of the *Summa* I could analyse offered a different portrait of this collection, suggesting that Iacobus deemed his writings as definitive only after a meticulous process of additions and modifications – as in the case of the *summa de decurionibus*, which he completed around 1234. Surely after 1234, he went on expanding the *Liber Ardizonis* and updating his *Summa* accordingly. It is possible to outline very roughly the succession of the traditions I analysed.

Lat. 4677 transmits the first known version of the *Summa* based on the *Liber Ardizonis*. It cites Extr. I-IV and Extr. VI, but does not contain references to Extr. V. Moreover, since it does not offer any *SF T*, *Lat. 4677* is likely to reflect a phase in which Extr. I was perhaps an appendix to the *Liber*, and the *Privilegium scholasticum* had not become Extr. V yet. *Parma 1227* offers evidence of a second phase, as it refers to Extr. V, but does not contain a critique to a passage of the *libelli iuris civilis* of Roffredus Beneventanus¹⁰⁸ occurring in both *Lat. 16008* (ff. 54va-vb), which is thus successive to *Parma 1227*, and *Asti 1518* (*SF J*, ff. 34rb-34va). *Wien 2094* offers an incomplete transcription, which does not reach the passage about

¹⁰⁷ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 161-165.

¹⁰⁸ Laspeyres dates Roffredus's chapters to 1235 or earlier, which does not change the substance of my point: LASPEYRES, *Über die Entstehung*, cit. (footnote 1), pp. 19 and 72-73.

Roffredus.¹⁰⁹ All the later traditions present titles *SF* A-O and T-Y, which means that Iacobus may have compiled titles Extr. V-VII only for the sake of completeness. The fact that the Pseudo-Revigny cited both Extr. VI. 5 – which Seckel dated to 1238-9 – and title *De quibusdam aliis capitulis extraordinariis de feudis* – which amounts to the allegedly spurious chapters *SF* U. 2-8 – proves the vitality of the text in the 1240s, as the *summa* of the Pseudo-Revigny was seemingly concluded by 1250. From what we have discovered about Iacobus's methodology, it is well possible that he collected the material amounting to the entire titles VI and VII after 1239, as well as the new title mentioned by the Pseudo-Revigny, which at least one of the traditions of his *Summa* transmits.

One last challenge, eventually, consists in inquiring on the origins of the last titles of the *Extravagantes* collection. Here, I limit myself to outlining some cautious hypotheses. Extr. VIII (*Consuetudo curiarum*) treats the case in which someone has his horse dead or injured while performing a horse service («Si quis equitaverit in servicio alicuius»), in which case the beneficiary of the service should pay the compensation for the damage.¹¹⁰ Iacobus dealt with horse services in chapter *Quando datur feudum ad servicium equi*, a text which is present only in the versions of the *Summa* successive to 1234. He tells us that in Verona it was held «by custom» that, should a feudal lord require a *servicium equi*, as long as he benefitted from the vassal's service, he was to pay for the horse's maintenance and compensate the damages occurred to the horse throughout the duration of the service.¹¹¹ The similarities with Extr. VIII § 1 are evident and suggest a striking concordance of intents between Iacobus and its unknown author. However, the attentiveness of the former towards the feudal relations in seigniorial *curie* and local usages in the rural context is no mystery.¹¹² Now, what is more interesting is that Iacobus's was not an isolated case. Evidence from the *Summa Feudorum* of Odofredus Denari – the author of another *Rekonzinnation*, the *Liber Odofredi* – shows a similar

¹⁰⁹ It reproduces, however, a version very similar to that of *Parma 1227* and *Lat. 16008*, that is, successive to *Lat. 4677*.

¹¹⁰ See the text in **Appendix 2**, p. ---

¹¹¹ *Asti 1518*, ff. 9ra-rb: «Et dum equus est apud dominum, vel precium equi vel si culpa domini equus sit peremptus, non tenetur vasallus alium equum domino emere, sed dominus restituat vel emat equum, et vasallus eum retinebit».

¹¹² This is the main point of STELLA, *La Summa feudorum*, cit. (footnote 95).

approach. While Odofredus was serving as an assessor of the *podestà* of Padua, in 1236, he was indeed fascinated by the *feuda condicionalia*¹¹³ which he observed in the contado of Padua among the clientele of the Abbey of Santa Maria di Praglia:¹¹⁴

In monasterio Pratalie multa talia vidi feu(da), et bovaria, et porcaria, et similia quae sunt necessaria (*Lat. 16008*, f. 82vb)

The mention of fiefs granted in exchange for cow-keeping, swine-keeping, or other necessary matters confirms on the one hand that feudal bonds were utilised to frame an incredibly broad set of professional activities, even the humblest,¹¹⁵ and, on the other one, that these practices somehow attracted thirteenth-century learned lawyers. Even though the attribution of Extr. VIII-XV remains a mystery, these titles embody some of the commonest objects of bargain – and thus litigation – in the sphere of local power. These connections between learned law and peasant practices, I believe, call for further in-depth research.

10. Conclusions

This reappraisal of the *Liber Ardigonis* is due to the extraordinary and dynamic source which is Iacobus's *Summa feudorum*. Through its manuscript traditions, I could confirm how the *Libri Feudorum*, still in the 1230-40s, were conceived of as a fluid text, to be commented, extended and improved. However, the reasons for the circulation of different versions of the *Summa* are not easy to comprehend. If one of its main purposes was clearly that of supporting lawyers in judicial practice,¹¹⁶ one may very hypothetically suggest that Iacobus used it as a

¹¹³ In his *Summa* he described the *feuda condicionalia* as follows: «Feuda alia pura alia condicionalia ... condicionalia quando opponuntur condiciones, scilicet ut per hoc faciat certum servitium propter id, ut in feudo de caballo, vel quando datur in hoc ut sit et scutifer, vel quando datur propter inhabitationem, scilicet quod debeat inhabitari. Et ista feuda condicionalia amittuntur si non faciat vasallus id propter quod datum est feudum»: *Lat. 16008*, f. 82vb.

¹¹⁴ S. BORTOLAMI, *Un grande patrimonio monastico medioevale: Formazione, consistenza e conduzione dei possedi di S. Maria di Praglia (1107-1448)*, in *Chiese, spazi, società nelle Venezie medioevali*, a cura di S. Bortolami, Roma, 1999, pp. 227-258.

¹¹⁵ B. CASTIGLIONI, *L'altro feudalesimo: vassallaggio, servizio e selezione sociale in area veneta nei secoli XI-XIII*, Venezia, 2010.

¹¹⁶ STELLA, *La Summa feudorum*, cit. (footnote 95).

teaching book. In his *summa De decurionibus*, he admitted to having taught Roman law, and it is very likely that his teaching activity on the *Tres Libri* was wider than we might suspect.¹¹⁷ This is why it is possible – but still to be proven – that his activity as a feudist aimed also to a similar purpose.

Among the *Rekonzinnationen* of the thirteenth century, Iacobus's is the best known. The *Liber Odofredi* still awaits a systematic survey, but we already know that it consisted of just a reorganisation of the messy material of the *Libri Feudorum*, which Odofredus carried out by reordering its content by subject, without adding any material to it.¹¹⁸ Eventually, neither the *Liber Ardiŕonis* nor the *Liber Odofredi* succeeded in replacing the tradition of the *Libri* which led to the *vulgata*, once Accursius approved it, around 1250. The success of the Accursian standard, legitimised by the Bolognese school, caused the eventual decline of its alternative traditions. If no text, but many traces are available of the *Liber Ardiŕonis* and the *Liber Odofredi*, the other paths that the *Libri Feudorum* might have walked – the *Liber Symonis* and the *Liber Iacobi de Aurelianis* – having been sentenced to an almost complete *damnatio memoriae*.

¹¹⁷ IACOBUS DE ARDIZONE, *Summa de decurionibus*, cit. (footnote 13), f. 446a: «Veruntamen quia hunc titulum legi, hanc sumulam composui». He wrote at least two more *summae* on Roman law: one on title *De praediis curialium* (C. 10.34) and one on title *Quando et a quibus quarta pars* (C. 10.35). The first is mentioned in the *De decurionibus* – «ut infra *De predi(is) curia(lium)*, *l(ege) ult(ima)*, et in summa illius tituli notavi» (Ibid., f. 448a), the second in his *Summa feudorum. Asti 1518*, f. 16rb.

¹¹⁸ SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 66-68.

Appendix 1

Synoptic table of the *Liber Ardizonis*, the *vulgata* and *antiqua* versions of the *Libri Feudorum*.¹¹⁹

COMPILACIO FEUDORUM SECUNDUM AR(DIZONEM) (WIEN 2094, f. 72ra-rc) TITLE, Chapter, § Paragraph	VULGATA TITLES (Lehmann, 1896) Book. Title	ANTIQUA TITLES (Lehmann, 1896) Title. Chapter
Title A. QUIBUS MODIS FEUDUM ACQUIRITUR ET RETINEATUR		
1. Quia de feudis	[LF I. 1]	[Ant. 1.1]
2. Quia vidimus § Hoc quoque sciendum est		[Ant. 1.2] [Ant. 1.3]
3. Notandum est autem § Item illud, quod datur	[LF I. 2]	[Ant. 1.4]
4. Si vero archiepiscopus	[LF I. 3]	[Ant. 1.5-6]
5. Sin autem controversia § Si quis de manso uno	[LF I. 4]	[Ant. 1.7]
Title B. QUIBUS MODIS FEUDUM AMITTITUR		
1. Quia supra dictum est § Item si episcopus	[LF I. 5] [LF I. 6]	[Ant. 2]
Title C. DE NATURA FEUDI		
1. Natura feudi	[LF I. 7]	[Ant. 3]
Title D. DE SUCCESSIONE FEUDI		
1. Sequitur vero § Si quis fuerit investitus	[LF I. 8] [LF I. 9]	[Ant. 4.1] [Ant. 4.2]
Title E. DE CONTENTIONE FEUDI		
1. Si fuerit contentio	[LF I. 10]	[Ant. 5.1]
2. Similiter si quis voluerit § Si contentio fuerit § Si clientulus	[LF I. 11] [LF I. 12] [LF I. 13]	[Ant. 5.2] [Ant. 5.3]
Title F. QUALITER USUS BENEFICII SIT RETINENDUS		
1. Qui de marchia § Si capitanei § Si duo fratres § Si femina	[LF I. 14] [LF I. 15]	[Ant. 6.1] [Ant. 6.2] [Ant. 6.3] [Ant. 6.4]
2. Si minores	[LF I. 16]	
3. Si capitanei	[LF I. 17]	[Ant. 6.5]
4. Si contentio	[LF I. 18]	
5. Si vero fuerit		
6. Si aliquis		[Ant. 6.6]

¹¹⁹ Sources: *Wien 2094*, f. 72ra-rc; Lehmann, *Langobardische*, cit. (footnote 3). The table mentions only the paragraphs of the *Liber Ardizonis* corresponding to chapters of the *antiqua* or *vulgata*. Some chapters of the *Liber* also appear in the second *extravagantes* collection of Iacobus: these references are in square brackets and bold type after the incipit of the matching text. For a fuller edition of the *Liber* and its sources, see SECKEL, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 136-152.

7. Si quis ex militum [Extr. II. 19]	[LF I. 19]	[Ant. 6.7]
8. Si quis miles (mortuus) [Extr. II. 19]		[Ant. 6.8]
§ Si quis adquisierit	[LF I. 20]	[Ant. 6.9]
§ Sancimus ut nemo miles sine cognita	[LF I. 21]	[Ant. 6.10]
§ Si quis miles		[Ant. 6.11]
§ Sancimus ut nemo miles ultra	[LF I. 22]	[Ant. 6.12(11)]
9. Si quis dominus [Extr. II. 19]		[Ant. 6.13(-)]
10. Sancimus ut nemo miles eiciatur [Extr. II. 19]		[Ant. 6.14(12)]
§ Si quis miles (in possessione)	[LF I. 23]	[Ant. 6.15(13)]

Title G. QUALITER IUDICIUM FE(UDI) SIT EXAMINANDUM

1. Si quis sine [Extr. II. 19]	[LF I. 24]	[Ant. 6.16(14)]
2. Sciendum est	[LF I. 25]	[Ant. 7.1]
3. Si dominus		[Ant. 7.2]
§ Si inter dominum	[LF I. 26]	[Ant. 7.3]
§ Si quis se		[Ant. 7.4]
§ Si aliquis		[Ant. 7.5]
§ Si quis obligaverit	[LF I. 27]	[Ant. 7.6]
§ Si quis investierit		[Ant. 7.7]
§ Quidam obligavit	[LF I. 28]	[Ant. 7.8]

Title H. EXPLICIT LIBER PRIMUS. INCIPIT SECUNDUS

1. Ubertus [=Ant.]	[LF II. 1]	[Ant. 8.1]
§ Sciendum est		[Ant. 8.2]
2. Investitura	[LF II. 2]	[Ant. 8.3]
§ Si vero vasallus		[Ant. 8.4]
§ Investitura autem	[LF II. 3]	[Ant. 8.5]
§ Personam vero		[Ant. 8.6]
§ Femina quoque		[Ant. 8.7]
§ Nulla		[Ant. 8.8]
§ Utrum autem	[LF II. 4]	[Ant. 8.9-10]

Title J. QUALITER IURARE DEBEAT VASALLUS

1. Qualiter autem	[LF II. 5]	[Ant. 8.11]
[abest]	[LF II. 6]	[abest]
[abest]	[LF II. 7pr]	[abest]
§ Investitura vero	[LF II. 7.1]	[Ant. 8.12]
§ Cum de re aliena	[LF II. 8]	[Ant. 8.13]
§ Rei autem		[Ant. 8.14]
§ E contrario		[Ant. 8.15]
§ Est enim optima	[LF II. 9]	
§ Qui a principe	[LF II. 10]	[Ant. 8.16]
§ Per successionem	[LF II. 11]	[Ant. 8.17]

Title K. NOVUM NON PATERNUM

1. Si duo fratres	[LF II. 12]	[Ant. 8.18]
§ 1 Si duo fratres in communi		[Ant. 8.19]
2. Ticius a Sempronio	[LF II. 13]	[Ant. 8.20]
§ Quidam vasallus	[LF II. 14]	[Ant. 8.21]
§ Vasallus	[LF II. 15]	[Ant. 8.22]
3. Si inter dominum	[LF II. 16]	[Ant. 8.23]
4. Qui sibi	[LF II. 17]	[Ant. 8.24]

§ Duo fratres	[LF II. 18]	[Ant. 8.25]
5. Si inter dominum et fidelem	[LF II. 19]	[Ant. 8.26]
§ Ex eo quod scriptum est	[LF II. 20]	[Ant. 8.27]
§ Miles	[LF II. 21]	[Ant. 8.28]
§ Dominus vocat	[LF II. 22]	[Ant. 8.29]
6. Qui de marchia	[abest]	[Ant. 9.1]
§ Si capitanei	[abest]	[Ant. 9.2]
§ Si duo fratres	[abest]	[Ant. 9.3]
[abest]	[abest]	[Ant. 9.5]
[abest]	[abest]	[Ant. 9.5]
Title L. IN QUIBUS CAUSIS FEUDUM AMITTATUR		
1. Ubertus	[LF II. 23]	[Ant. 10.1]
§ Huius autem generis		
2. Prima autem causa	[LF II. 24]	[Ant. 10.2]
Title M. SI DE FEUDO VASALLUS FUERIT INTERPELLATUS		
1. Negotium	[LF II. 25]	[abest]
§ Si de feudo defuncti	[LF II. 26]	[abest]
[abest = Q. 1 = Extr. IV.14]	[LF II. 27]	[abest]
Title N. HIC INCIPIUNT CONSUETUDINES REGNI		
1. Domino guerram	[LF II. 28]	[abest]
§ Quidam habens	[LF II. 29]	[abest]
§ Si femina	[LF II. 30]	[abest]
§ Vasalli	[LF II. 31]	[abest]
§ Si vero clericus (=Sive clericus)	[LF II. 32]	[abest]
§ Sciendum est itaque	[LF II. 33]	[abest]
2. Lex Conradi	[LF II. 34]	[abest]
§ Clerico	[LF II. 35]	[abest]
§ Mutus	[LF II. 36]	[abest]
§ Si quis interfecerit	[LF II. 37]	[abest]
§ Si vasallus contra const(itutionem)	[LF II. 38]	[abest]
§ Alienacio	[LF II. 39]	[abest]
3. Haec sunt capitula	[LF II. 40]	[abest]
§ Item sciendum	[LF II. 41]	[abest]
§ Domino cum emptore	[LF II. 42]	[abest]
§ Praeterea si vasallus	[LF II. 44]	[abest]
§ Si contigerit	[LF II. 45]	[abest]
§ Ex eo quod supra diximus	[LF II. 46]	[abest]
§ Ex facto	[LF II. 47]	[abest]
§ Si quis ea	[LF II. 48]	[abest]
§ Tres erant	[LF II. 49]	[abest]
Title O. QUI DEBEANT SUCCEDERE IN FE(UDUM)		
1. Successionis	[LF II. 50]	[abest]
§ Quidam capitaneus	[LF II. 51]	[abest]
Title O'.		
2. In nomine sancte et individue Trinitatis Extr. II. 32	[abest]	[abest]
3. Imperialis benevolencie Extr. II. 23	[LF II 52 part I]	[abest]
4. De militum Extr. II. 33	[abest]	[abest]

5. Imperialem decet solertiam Extr. II. 24	[LF II. 55]	[abest]
Title P. QUE SIT FORMA SACRAMENTI FIDELITATIS ET QUALITER IURARE DEBEAT VASALLUS		
1. De forma Extr. III. 1	[LF II.6]	[abest]
2. Si quis laycus Extr. III. 2	[abest]	[abest]
3. A fidelitatis Extr. III. 3	[abest]	[abest]
4. Alius item Extr. III. 8	[abest]	[abest]
5. Iuratos Extr. III. 6	[abest]	[abest]
6. Tibi domino Extr. III. 9	[abest]	[abest]
7. Est et alia Extr. III. 29	[LF II. 7pr]	[abest]
8. Qui fidelitatem Extr. III. 28	[abest]	[abest]
Title Q. DE PACE TENENDA		
1. Quoniam divina Extr. IV. 14	[LF II. 27]	[abest]
2. Hac edictali Extr. IV. 15	[LF II. 53]	[abest]
3. Ad hec Extr. II.26	[LF II. 54]	[abest]
4. Notandum Extr. I. 1-11	[LF II. 58]	[abest]
Title R. QUE SINT REGALIE		
1. Regalie Extr. II. 27	[LF II. 56]	[abest]
2. Omnis Extr. II. 28	[abest]	[abest]
3. Palacia Extr. II. 29	[abest]	[abest]
[4. T]ributum Extr. II. 30	[abest]	[abest]
Title S. DE PACE CONSTANCIE	[abest]	[abest]
Title T. DE VARIIS ET EXTRA ORDINEM CAPITULIS ET ALTERIUS COMPILACIONIS FEUDORUM		
	[see Appendix 2]	[abest]
Title U. DE FEUDIS ET BENEFICIIS	[see Appendix 2]	[abest]
Title X. DE FORMA ET SACRAMENTO FIDELITATIS	[see Appendix 2]	
Title Y. DE PACE ET TREUGA (!) TENENDA ET COMPONENDA		
	[see Appendix 2]	[abest]

Appendix 2

The *Extravagantes* Collection of the *Liber Ardizonis*

Appendix 2 lists the chapters constituting the second *extravagantes* collection of Iacobus de Ardizone. The description consists of the incipit as transmitted in *Wien 2094* and, in square brackets, the occurrence of the chapters in the primary sources cited in the essay.

In bold type, the feudal law sources: Iacobus's *Summa feudorum* [*SF* T and U, in the traditional rubrication: SF 149 and 150], the collection O'-S, which is outlined in Appendix 1, and cross-references to other sections of the *extravagantes* collection (Extr. I-XV); the *Libri Feudorum* [LF]; the *Capitula extraordinaria Iacobi de Ardizone* [C. ex. Iac.] and *Baraterii* [C. ex. Bar.]: Lehmann, *Langobardische*, cit. (footnote 3), pp. 186-200.

In regular font: the *Lombarda* (I refer to Bluhme's rubrication of the *vulgata* edition: M.G.H., *Leges* II, pp. 623-638); Canon law sources: the *Decretum Gratiani* (Decr.), the *Compilaciones Antiquae* (Comp. I-V), and the *Liber Extra* (X.); Roman law sources: the *Codex* (Cod.) and the *Novellae Constitutiones* (Nov.); Frederick II's *Constitutiones Regni Siciliae* (1231). Frederick I's constitutions in Extr. IV.22 and V.1 and Frederick II's constitutions in Extr. VI. 1, 4, 5 and VII. 1-2, do not occur in any of the codes mentioned above, so I provided a brief heading, the year of enactment, and a reference to the M.G.H.

The last eight titles, the source of which is unknown, are fully transcribed (Extr. VIII-XV). For a more exhaustive analysis of these sources and the glosses in *Wien 2094*, see: Seckel, *Quellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), pp. 73-114.

**EXTR. I. DE CAPITULIS EXTRAORDINARIIS ET ALTERIUS
COMPILACIONIS FEUDORUM**

1. Notandum est in feudo – in coniugem [LF II.58pr.]
2. Quod autem pares – contempta est [LF II.58 § 1]
3. Item sciendum est – ut dividat [LF II.58 § 2, part 1]
4. Item heres eius – pater fecit [LF II.58 § 2, part 2]
5. Item eadem lege – XL annos [LF II.58 § 2, part 3]
6. Item investitura – comuni di(vidundo) [LF II.58 § 2, parts 4-5]
7. Idcirco pares – in paribus [LF II.58 § 2, part 6]
8. Si instrumentum dicatur – non possideat [LF II.58 § 3]
9. Notandum est quod de omni – l. ult. [LF II.58 § 4]
10. Cum (datur) domino defensio – antecessore suo [LF II.58 § 5, part 1]
11. Si qua investitura – l. si contingerit et l. se. si post mortem [LF II.58 § 5, parts 2-3]
12. Illud quodue curiali usu – parium laudacione domino faciat [Cap. ex. Bar. 7]
13. Si de allodio – eos mutant (mittant) [C. ex. Bar. 8, part frase 1a]
14. Beneficium intelligitur quasi ex bono – sepius fit [C. ex. Bar. 8, part 1b]
15. Si dominum offensus – dirimant [C. ex. Bar. 8 part 2]
16. Si inter duos – cognicio [C. ex. Bar. 8 part 3]
17. Si vasallus spernit [C. ex. Bar. 8, part 4]
18. Beneficium intelligitur quasi ex bono [C. ex. Bar. 1, part 1]
19. De fidelitate autem [C. ex. Bar. 1, part 2-3]
20. Beneficium intelligitur investitura [C. ex. Bar. 3]
21. Si quis nominatim [C. ex. Bar. 5]
22. Beneficium paternum [C. ex. Bar. 2, 6, 4]
23. Summo opere (summopere) [SF T. 1]
24. Feuda scutiferorum [SF T. 2]
25. Ut inter condicionalia [SF T. 3]
26. Quoniam de fidelitate [SF T. 4, parts 1-3]
27. Si cui militi [SF T. 4, parts 4-5]
28. Librum autem [SF T. 4, part 6]
29. Evenit aliquando [SF T. 4, part 7]

30. Qui fidelitatem [SF T. 4, part 8]
31. Cum plures fratres [SF T. 5]
32. Cum feudum [SF T. 6]
33. Si contencio fuerit [SF T. 7]
34. Generaliter verum est [SF T. 8]
35. Unum quidem non minus [SF T. 9]
36. Si qua contencio [SF T. 10]
37. Si alter ex fratribus [SF T. 11]
38. Quoddam usui [SF T. 12]
39. Si maritur [SF T. 13]
40. Unum quidem satis usitatum [SF T. 14]
41. In beneficiis [SF T. 15]
42. De ingressu curie [SF T. 16]
43. Beneficia condicionalia [SF T. 17]
44. Si duo fratres [SF T. 18]
45. Beneficium intelligitur de veteri [SF T. 19, part 1]
46. Dicitur etiam quod [SF T. 19, part 2]
47. Quicumque paratus [SF T. 20]
48. Quoddam satis bene [SF T. 21, part 1]
[§] Quidam miles [SF T. 21, part 2]
49. Quod nomine gastaldie [SF T. 22]
50. Quidam dominus benef. reliquit [SF T. 23]
51. Qui accipit [SF T. 24]
52. Inter dominum [SF T. 25]
53. Dicimus autem [SF T. 25, conclusion]
54. Vasallus habens [SF T. 26]

EXTR. II. DE FEUDIS ET BENEFICIIS CONSTITUTIONES REGALES, IMPERIALES ET DECRETALES

1. Rex Liup. (Liutprandus). Si infans – dinoscitur [Lombarda, 2, 29, 2]
2. Imperator Kar. (Karolus). Ut iudices – presolvant [Lombarda, 2, 39, 3]

3. Id. Si quis ad mallum – interrogetur [Lombarda, 2, 43, 1]
4. Id. Quicumque beneficium – amittat [Lombarda, 3, 8, 1]
5. Id. Precipimus etiam – faciant [Lombarda, 3, 3, 2]
6. Imperator Lodoicus. Et qui nonas – amittat [Lombarda, 3, 3, 5]
7. Imperator Kar(olus). Ut servi – faciant [Lombarda, 2, 44, 2]
8. Imperator Pip(pinus). De exenodochiis – habeat [Lombarda, 3, 1, 31]
9. Id. Si forsitan – faciat [Lombarda, 2, 52, 14]
10. Id. Qui latronem in hospicio – dampnetur [Lombarda, 1, 25, 82]
11. Id. [Lodoicus?]. Si quis proprium – iudicandus est [Lombarda, 1, 34, 3]
12. Imperator Lodoicus. Si liber – amittat [Lombarda, 3, 7, 1]
13. Id. Quicumque terram – valeat precipimus [Lombarda, 3, 8, 2-3]
14. Id. Si quis in aliena – dereliquit ei [Lombarda, 2, 41, 7]
15. Imperator Karolus. Si vassallus noster iusticiam – faciat [Lombarda, 2, 52, 2]
16. Id. Vasalli nostri et – accipiant [Lombarda, 3, 1, 39]
17. Imperator Loth(arius). Ubi cumque per legem – pugna fiat [Lombarda, 2, 55, 31]
18. Imperator Otho. De investitura – edicimus [Lombarda, 2, 56, 38]
19. Imperator Loth(arius). Quicumque igitur ex ordine militum decedens [**LF I. 19-24**]
20. Imperator Henricus. Si vasallus [**LF II. 57**]
21. Imperator Lotharius. Quoniam inter dominum et vasallum [**LF II.52 part III**]
22. Id. Satis bene dispositum est [**LF II.52 part II**]
23. Id. Imperialis benevolencie [**LF II.52 part I = O'. 4**]
24. Imperator Fredericus. Imperialem decet solerciam [**LF II.55 = O'. 6**].
25. Id. Si duo homines pro uno beneficio contendunt [**LF II. 27 §§ 7, 8, 16 = Q. 1 § 7**]
26. Id. Ad hec qui allodium [**LF II. 54 = Q. 3**].
27. Id. Regalia sunt hec: artimandie (!), vie publice [**LF II. 56 = R. 1**].
28. Id. Omnis iurisdictio et omnis districtus [**LF II. 56 = R. 2**]
29. Id. Palacia et pretoria [**LF II. 56 = R. 3**]
30. Id. Tributum dabatur [**LF II. 56 = R. 4**]
31. Id. Vasalli qui pro tempore guerre [**S De pace Consanciae**]
32. Imperator Conradus. In nomine sancte ed invidue trinitatis [= **O'. 3**]
33. Imperator aug(ustus) Henricus. De militum beneficiis – vel emendet [**O'. 5 = SF U. 1 = C. ex.**

Iac. 28]

34. Alexander III Hospitalariis. Cum seculum reliqueritis et infra. [Comp. I. 3.33.16; X. 3.38.13]
35. Id. Ex transmissa nobis [Comp. II 2.2.2; X. 2.2.6]
36. Idem papa. Verum quoniam de quibusdam [Comp. II. 2.2.3; X. 2.2.7]
37. Celestinus papa III, Rav(ennatensi) episcopo. Ut super aliqua et infra [Comp. II. 3.10.1; X. 3.13.8]
38. Innocencius papa III, Tyron. facultaten. episcopo [Comp. III. 1.1.2; X. 1.2.7]
39. Innocencius III Maur(iensi) episcopo. Insinuacione presencium [Comp. III. 3.16.1; X. 3.20.1]
40. Idem, archiepiscopo Mediolan(ensis). Ex parte tua nostro [Comp. III. 3.16.2; X. 3.20.2]
41. Idem, episcopo Florentino. Per tuas litteras proponere [Comp. III. 3.18.2; X.3.24.5]
42. Idem, episcopo Maur(iensi). Ad nostram noveris audienciam per(venisse) [Comp. III. 3.13.2; X. 3.13.11]
43. Idem, Vercell(ensi) episcopo. Tua et infra, porro cum laycis [Comp. IV.3.9.4; X. 3.30.25]
44. Idem papa. Cum apostolica sedes et infra, sane sicut [Comp. III. 3.11.1; X. 3.10.7]
45. Idem papa, in concilio generali. Plerique sicut accepimus [Comp. IV. 1.15.1; X. 1.35.7]
46. Idem papa. Cum laicis quamvis religiosiis [Comp. IV. 3.5.1; X. 3.13.12]
47. Idem papa. Ad aures nostri appostolatus pervenit [Comp. IV. 5.13.1; X. 5.37.10]
48. Idem papa. In quibusdam provinciis et infra [Comp. IV. 5.13.2; X. 5.37.12]
49. Alexander. Ceterum quia in eos quos ab ecclesia [Comp. I. 2.1.7; X. 2.1.5]
50. Idem papa. Conquestus est nobis B. clericus [Comp. I. 5.15.10; X. 5.19.8]
51. Innocencius III. Novit ille qui nichil ignorat et infra [Comp. 2.1.3; X. 2.1.13]
52. Idem papa. Ad audienciam app(osto)latus nostri perve(nit) et infra [Comp. III. 2.17.3; X. 2.26.13]
53. Innocencius III. Nuper a nobis tua [Comp. III. 4.15.2; X. 4.20.6]
54. Honorius III. Vestra nobis relatio declaravit [Comp. V. 3.11.1, X. 3.18.2]
55. Idem papa. Ex parte B. quondam Anglie [Comp. V. 2.2.1; X. 2.2.15]
56. Idem papa. Gravem venerabilis F. [Comp. V. 5.18.5; X. 5.39.53]
57. Gregorius IX. Prelatorum excessus et infra [X. 5.1.27]

EXTR. III. DE FORMA ET SACRAMENTO FIDELITATIS ET EIUS REMISSIONE

1. De forma fidelitatis [Decr. C. 22 q.5. c. 18 = **P. 1 = LF II. 6**]
2. Aug(ustinus). Si quis laycus iuramentum [Decr. C.22 q.5 c. 19 = **P. 2**]
3. Nicolaus papa. A fidelitatis etiam iuramento [Decr. C.15 q.6 c. 3 dict. Gratiani = **P. 3**]

4. Gregorius III. Ego episcopus ab hec hora [Comp. I.1.4.20; X. 2.24.4]
5. Gregorius VII. Non sanctorum predecessorem [Decr. C. 15 q. 6 c. 4]
6. Urbanus II. Iuratos milites negotii [Decr. C. 15 q.6. c.5 = **P. 5**]
7. Idem papa. Nullus episcopus clericos suos [Decr. C. 22 q. 5 c. 23 Palea; Comp. I. 2. 17.1; X. 2. 24. 5]
8. Ungelasius (!), Anastasio imperatori. Alius item Romanus pontifex [Decr. C. 15 q. 6 c. 3 = **P. 4**]
9. Constitutio Othonis. Tibi domino Iohanni pape ego rex Otho [Decr. Dist. 63 c. 33 = **P. 6**]
10. Alexander III. Ex diligenti tua relatione innotuit [Comp. I. 5.2.19; X. 5.3.17]
11. Lucius III. Indignum est eet a Romane ecclesie [Comp. I. 5.37.13 e II. 5.13.2; X. 5.41.11]
12. Clemens III. Veritatis amica simplicitas et infra [Comp. II. 2.16.5, X. 2.24.14]
13. Innocencius III. Ea te credimus discretionem vigere [Comp. III. 2.15.8; X. 2.24.22]
14. Idem papa. Cum clerici Placentini iuramentum [Comp. III. 5.23.3; X. 5.40.19]
15. Idem papa. Nimis de iure divino quidam laici [Comp. IV. 2.9.3; X. 2.24.30]
16. Honorius III. Peticio vestra nobis exhibita [Comp. V. 2.1.1; X. 2.24.31]
17. Gregorius IX. Absolutos se noverint a debito [X. 5.7.16]
18. Honorius III. Intellecto iam dudum quod ca(rissimus) [Comp. V. 2.15.3]
19. Innocencius III. Si vero dominus temporalis requisitus [Comp. IV. 5.5.2, X. 5.7.13 § 3; see also: **Extr. VI. 7**]
20. Honorius III. Gravem capituli Laudun(ensi) recepimus [Comp. V. 5.15.2; X. 5.37.13]
21. Idem papa. Gravem et dolorem (Gravamen et dolorem) [Comp. V. 5.13.1; X. 5.31.15]
22. Lucius III papa. Retulit nobis dilectus filius [Comp. II. 5.13.2]
23. Innocen(cius) III. Si diligentiet infra [Comp. III. 2.17.7; X. 2.26.17]
24. Imperator Iustinianus. Iusiurandum quod prestatur [Nov. 8, *Iusiurandum*]
25. Imperator Fridericus. Illud quoque sanctimus [**O'. 6 § Illud quoque = Extr. II. 24 § Ult. = LF II.55 § 8**]
26. Imperator Fredericus et Henricus sextus. Vasalli nostri [= S; = Extr. II. 31]
27. In nomine Christi iuro ego quodammodo fidelis ero [**S. De pace Constanciae**]
28. Qui fidelitatem iurant [= **P. 7**]
29. Est et alia de novo [= **P. 8 = LF II.7 pr.**]

EXTR. IV. DE PACE ET TREUGA TENENDA ET COMPONENTA. RUBRICA

1. Rex Karolus. Si quis ex nostris – faciat [Lombarda 1, 13, 1]
2. Rex Liutp(randus). Si iudex – causa est [Lombarda 2, 24, 1]
3. Imperator Kar(olus). Et vindictam – emendet [Lombarda 1, 25, 74-75]
4. Idem Kar(olus). Qui pacem – mulctetur [Lombarda 1, 14, 14]
5. Idem. Si quis ad ecclesiam – presumat [Lombarda 2, 39, 5]
6. Idem. Ut episcopi – iudicetur [Lombarda 2, 45, 1]
7. Idem. De armis – persolvat [Lombarda 1, 37, 2]
8. Imperator Pip(pinus). De advenis – pertinuit [Lombarda 1, 9, 29]
9. Imperator Lodoicus. Si quis aliqua – sacramentum. [Lombarda 1, 9, 35]
10. Idem. Ubi ex utraque – inponatur [Lombarda 2, 51, 11]
11. Imperator Loth(arius). De hiis qui – faciendum sit [Lombarda 1, 37, 3]
12. Imperator Wido. Placuit ut episcopi – transeant terram [Lombarda 2, 53, 2]
13. Imperator Henricus. Qui infra treugam – perdat [Lombarda 1, 9, 39]
14. Imperator Fridericus. Quoniam divina preordinante clementia [**Q. 1 = LF II. 27**]
15. Idem. Hac edictali lege in perpetuum valitura sancimus ut omnes [**Q. 2 = LF II. 53**]
16. Idem. Agricultores et circa rem rusticam [**Ext. VI.1 § 10**]
17. Alexander III papa. Treugas a quarta feria post [Comp. I. 1.24.1; X. 1.34.1]
18. Decrevit sancta synodus [Decr. C. 22. q.5 c.17]
19. Alexander III. Innovamus ut presbiteri monachi (conversi) peregrini [Comp. I. 1.24.2; X. 1.34.2]
20. Imperator Th(eodosius). Hyrenarche – nominetur [Cod. 10.77(75).1]
21. Imperator Fridericus et Henricus.... Imperialis clemencie [**S. De pace Constanciae**]
22. Imperator Fridericus. Hac edictali lege [*constitutio Auximana*, 1177: *extravagans*]¹²⁰

EXTR. V. DE PRIVILEGIO SCOLASTICO

1. Idem imperator. Habita super hoc – inseri iubemus [*privilegium scholasticum*, 1158: *extravagans*]¹²¹

¹²⁰ FRIDERICUS I, *Constitutio Auximana*, MGH Leges IV/1, pp. 378-379.

¹²¹ FRIDERICUS I, *Constitutiones*, MGH Leges IV/1, p. 249.

EXTR. VI. DE PRIV(I)LEG(IIS) ECCLESiarUM ET QUARUNDAM HUMILIUM PERSONARUM, ET DE HERETICIIS ET FAUTORIBUS, ET DE NAUFRAGIS ET PEREGRINIS. RUBRICA.

1. Fridericus [II] Dei gracia Romanorum imperator... Ad decus [*constitutio in Basilica Beati Petri*: 1220]¹²²
2. Imperator Fridericus II^{us}. Inconsutilem tunicam [*Const. Reg. Siciliae*, I.1: 1231]
3. Idem aug(ustus). Patarenorum [*Const. Reg. Siciliae*, I.2: 1231]
4. Idem imperator. Adicimus... Data Padue XIII. febr., .XII. indic(itone) [*Edicta contra haereticos*, 1239]¹²³
5. Idem imperator. Conmissi nobis – II – innocencia filiorum [*Edicta contra haereticos*, 1239]¹²⁴

EXTR. VII. DE PENA IUDICUM MALE IUDICANTIUM

1. Cum falsitates – incurrere. Data Pad(ue), XXII. febr., XII. indic(tione) [*curia Paduae*, 22 February 1239]¹²⁵
2. Imperator Fridericus secundus. Corruptores – paciatur [-, 1231?]¹²⁶

EXTR. VIII. CONSUEtUDO CURIARUM

§ Si quis equitaverit in servicio alicuius et equitando equus eius mortuus fuerit in prelio vel casu vel malum equo evenerit in servicio eius, ita ut ex malo equus moriatur vel vastetur, ille in cuius servicio mortuus est equus vel vastatus, debet emendare equum, quanti ille cuius erat equus iuraverit valuisse tunc temporis quando equitabat cum eo, vel quanti equus deterior factus est.

§ Si quis ierit cum aliquo in servicio eius et amiserit aliquid in servicio eius in prelio vel casu aliquo, ille in cuius servicio fuit debet emendare id quod amisit ille qui erat in eius servicio, tanti quanti valebat res que amissa est. Et si dubitatio erit de precio, tunc ille cuius res amissa est vel deterior facta, iuret tantum valuisse, et tunc tanti estimetur quanti ille iuraverit rem valuisse vel deteriorem factam esse.

EXTR. VIII. CONSUEtUDO VENATORUM

(1) Si quis venatores alicuius terre ierint venatum, et ceperint porcum aut capreolum aut cervum, debent partiri secundum numerum guedarum, et illi de gueda debent iterum partiri secundum numerum

¹²² FRIDERICUS II, *Constitutiones*, MGH Leges IV/2, pp. 107-110.

¹²³ FRIDERICUS II, *Constitutiones*, MGH Leges IV/2, p. 285.

¹²⁴ FRIDERICUS II, *Constitutiones*, MGH Leges IV/2, pp. 281-2.

¹²⁵ FRIDERICUS II, *Curia Paduae*, M.G.H. Leges II, p. 330.

¹²⁶ FRIDERICUS II, *Curia Paduae*, M.G.H. Leges II, p. 330. SECKEL, *Quyellenfunde*, cit. (footnote 4), p. 117, dates this addition to 1231 or earlier, and not 22 February 1239 as suggested in the M.G.H.

personarum que sunt in gueda. Et cum illi faciunt partes, si alius qui non est venator supervenerit, etiam illi dare debent; et si alius venator supervenerit, etiam illi dare debent, non pro parte sed pro honore.

(2) Set si canis alicuius levaverit porcum aut capreolum aut cervum, et eum secutus fuerit, et alius venator audierit cazam et eam espectaverit, vel cucurrerit ad cazam, et porcum aut aut capreolum aut cervum cum suis canibus ceperit, et ille cuius canes levaverint cazam eam secutus fuerit, ipse vel canes eius, debet is qui ceperit habere partem, set ille cuius canes levaverint cazam debet habere ante partem capud et corium; et quod remanserit, parciendum est secundum numerum guedarum. Set si sui canes non fuerint secuti cazam, et ille dixerit “hec est mea caza quam cepisti,” et is qui eam ceperit dixerit “nescio si est tua vel non, quia tui canes eam non sequebantur, licet tu eam secutus fueris,” non est danda porcio illi qui eam secutum dixerit, nisi ostendere in veritate potuerit eam cazam suos canes levasse: tunc enim partiri debent, ut dictum est, secundum numerum guedarum.

EXTR. X. DE AMISSIONE AVIUM PAISSANCIUM

(1) Si quis habuerit sparvarium vel asturem vel falconem et ei aufugit, et eum persecutum fuerit eumque capere non potuerit, quia se soraverit, et per multos dies eum quesierit et habere eum non potuerit, et alius eum post multos dies ceperit, scilicet post dies .VIII. vel .XV., tamen debet domino qui amiserit reposcenti, et tempus amissionis dicenti et cognoscenti suum esse falconem, sparverium, vel asturem reddere, quia, quamdiu non habuerit animum relinquendi, tamdiu sparverium, falconem, vel asturem suum esse dicimus. Animum derelinquendi habere videtur cum eum non quesierit et homines de eo non interrogaverit ut, si quis viderit eum caperet vel si sciret aut audiret qui caperet, ei renunciaret.

EXTR. XI. CONSUETUDO SOCIETATIS IUMENTORUM

(1) Siquis dederit iumenta iure societatis, ille qui accepit debet tenere per .V. annos, si nichil dictum est de tempore; et omnes poledri debent esse comunes, et id quod quesierit tempore triturationis. Et in capite .V. annorum separatur societas, et ille qui dedit debet habere iumentum ante partem. Set si ille qui accepit dedit terciam, tunc iumenta et omnia parcenda sunt per medium. Et si amiserit iumenta sua culpa, quia non bene custodierit, et corium ostendere non potuerit vel caudam, emendare tunc debet.

(2) Si quis dederit iumenta coperiendi equo alicuius, omnes poledri debent esse comunes nati in illo anno de iumentis illis, parciendique sunt secundum conventionem. Et si alius equus coperuerit de iumentis illis, et ille cuius sunt iumenta, debet partiri poledros et mittere illi electionem cuius est equus, utrum velit accipere partem poledrum, an accipere partem precii secundum convencionem.

EXTR. XII. CONSUETUDO SOCIETATIS VACARUM

(1) Si quis dederit vacam alicui ut haberet eam iure societatis, et non dixit de tempore, debet eam tenere per .V. annos, et omnes vituli debent partiri per medium. Et ille qui dedit vacam, debet habere eam pro caposalvo [*ante partem?*] si nichil dictum est, et ille qui suscepit non dedit de suo in precio vace; alioquin, si partem precii dedit, omnia debet partiri per medium. Et si is qui accepit amiserit vacam sua culpa, quia custodem non miserit vel non bene custodierit, et propter hoc vaca amissa est quia fures abstulerunt vel lupo eam comedit, et corium non potest ostendere, debet eam emendare suo socio. Set si ille qui accepit debet primum

vitulum de vaca natum tenere pro coposalvo, et caposalvolus natus non est quia vaca primum mortua est sine culpa, tunc debet vendere carnem et corium vace, et emere aliam eandem condicione dominus de suo. Et si caposalvolus mortuus sine culpa ante tempus convencionis fuerit, perit domino, et dominus debet emere alium caposalvum, et omnia parcenda sunt secundum convencionem. Si autem incontrum acceperit pro caposalvulo, ambo debent emere coposalvum.

EXTR. XIII. CONSUEUDO SOCIETATIS CAPRARUM ET PECUDUM

(1) Si quis dederit capram aut pecudem iure societatis, ille qui accepit debet tenere per tres annos, et in unoquoque anno debet dare [pro] capra .XII. formaticos bonos et optimos, pro pecude .VI.; et medietas capretorum et agnorum debet esse comunis, et medietas lane. Et ille qui dedit capram aut pecudem, ante partem debet eam habere; set si ille qui accepit dedit terciam, tunc omnia p(ar)cienda sunt per medium. Et si ille qui accepit amiserit culpa sua, quia ea non custodierit vel pecorile non bene clausierit, domino tunc emendare debet. Et, ut dictum est, bonos formaticos dare debet, scilicet non quidem de una mungitura, quia, si dedi unam tantum pecudem aut unam capram tantum, non debe michi dare talem formaticum qualis potest fieri de una mungitura tantum, set tres aut .IIII. mungiture insimul mitti debent, ita ut bonus formaticus inde fiat: quia, si dedi alicui .xx. aut .xl. pecudes aut totidem capras, debetne mittere unam mungituram insimul et facere unum formaticum de tota mungitura; et certe non, sed medie extimacionis, ita quod non fraudetur qui dedit, nec qui accepit; set si agni vel capreoli nati non fuerint de una capra (vel pecude), pro illa capra vel pecude non debet dare nisi medietatem formatici quem daret si nati essent agni vel capreoli.

EXTR. XIV. CONSUEUDO SOCIETATIS PORCARUM

(1) Si quis dederit porciam alicui iure societatis et non fuerit dictum de tempore, tunc is qui accepit debet eam tenere per tres annos, et omnes porcelli qui nati fuerint parciendi sunt per medium in unoquoque anno. Vel si placuerit domino et ei qui accepit tenere usque in capite trium annorum, debent omnia partiri per medium, etiam porcellos natos de porcellis. Et cum porcia facit porcellos, debet dominus facere adiutorium ei qui accepit; (et non debet qui accepit) dare terciam aut incontrum; et si amiserit sua culpa quia porcile non bene clausierit vel custodem cum porcis non miserit, debet domino emendare, vel casum amissionis in veritate domino dicere.

EXTR. XV. CONSUEUDO SOCIETATIS ARVARUM

(1) Si quis dederit arvam iure societatis, ille qui accepit debet tenere per tres annos, et omnes fructus qui inde percepti sunt, parciendi sunt per medium. Et in capite trium annorum separatur societas, et ille qui dedit arvam devet eam habere ante partem; sed si ille qui accepit dedit terciam, tunc omnia parcienda sunt per medium.

Tab. 2. The ‘spurious’ chapters of Iacobus de Ardizone

SF U.1: Imperator Henricus, De militum beneficiis	[O'. 5 = Extr. II. 33 = Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 27]
SF U.2: Si quis investitus de feudo ligio	["De quibusdam aliis capitulis" = Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 28]
SF U.3: Ex facto incidisse scio	["De quibusdam aliis capitulis" = Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 29]
SF U.4: De negotio super quo 31]	["De quibusdam aliis capitulis" = Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 30-31]
SF U.5: Mulier quae feudum	["De quibusdam aliis capitulis" = Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 32]
SF U.6: Si cui militi ad certum servitium 34]	["De quibusdam aliis capitulis" = Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 33-34]
SF U.7: Iugales a quodam milite	["De quibusdam aliis capitulis" = Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 35]
SF U.8: Feuda habitacionum	["De quibusdam aliis capitulis" = Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 36]
SF U.9: Imperator Henricus. Si contingerit feudum incuria ¹²⁷	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 37]
SF U.10: Quaesitum scio dudumque apud prudentes	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 38]
SF U.11: Antiquatum esse ipsis rerum experimentis	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 39]
SF U.12: Gregorius Septimus. Si quis imperator, regum	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 40; Decr. C. 16 Q. 7 c. 12 § 1]
SF U.13: Quoniam investiture contra sanctorum	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 41; Decr. C. 16 Q. 7 c. 13]
SF U.14: Si quis clericus, abbas, vel monachus	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 41bis; Decr. C. 16 Q. 7 c. 16]
SF U.15: Constitutiones sanctorum canonum	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 42; Decr. C. 16 Q. 7 c. 17]
SF U.16: Maius est possessionem dare	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 43; Decr. C. 16 Q. 2 c. 1 § 1]
SF U.17: Nulla iuris constitutione	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 44]
SF U.18: Longinquitate temporis	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 45; Decr. C. 12 Q. 2 c. 64]
SF U.19: Liberti ecclesiae	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 46; Decr. C. 12 Q. 2 c. 65]
SF U.20: Quicunque fidelium propria devotione	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 47; Decr. C. 16 Q. 7 c. 30]
SF U.21: Et iure moribus receptum est 19]	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 48; derived from Decr. C. 23 Q. 8 c. 19]
SF U.22: Si quis episcopus saecularibus potestatibus	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 49; Decr. C. 16 Q. 7 c. 14]
SF U.23: Illud per omnia interdicimus	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 50; Decr. C. 12 Q. 2 c. 37 § 1]
SF U.24: Quicunque militum	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 51; Decr. C. 12 Q. 2 c. 4]
SF U.25: Si tributum petit imperator 8 c. 22]	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 52; Decr. C. 11 Q. 1 c. 27; C. 23 Q. 8 c. 22]
SF U.26: De his quae clerici emerint	[Cap. Extra. Iac. de Ard. 53; Decr. C. 23 Q. 8 c. 25, <i>dict. Grat.</i>]

Source: *Asti* 1518; Lehmann, *Langobardische*, cit. (footnote 3), pp. 186-198

¹²⁷ Of uncertain origin, dubiously attributed to Henry III: HENRICUS III, *Constitutiones*, M.G.H. Leges IV/1, p. 105.

Tab. 1. Synoptic table of the titles of the *Summa Feudorum*, the *Libri Feudorum* and the *Liber Ardizonis*. Source: *Lat. 4604* (Columns 1-2); *Asti 1518* (Columns 3-4)

Titles of <i>SF</i> in <i>Lat. 4604</i>	Titles of <i>LF</i> in the apparatus of <i>Lat. 4604</i>	Titles of <i>SF Asti 1518</i>	Titles of <i>L. Ard.</i> in the apparatus of <i>Asti 1518</i>
<p>Proemium [Book 1] A. [Quibus modis feudum acquiratur] B. [Quibus modis feudum amittatur] C. De natura feudi D. De successione feudi E. [De contentione feudi] F. [Qualiter usus beneficii sit tenendus] G. [Qualiter iudicium feudi sit examinandum] [Book 2] H. Explicit liber primus J. [Qualiter iurare debeat vasallus] K. Novum non paternum L. [Quibus causis feudum amittatur] M. [De interpellatione feudi] - [De pace tenenda et componenda] (<i>incomplete</i>)</p>	<p>[Book 1] A. Quibus modis feudum acquiratur B. Quibus modis feudum amittatur C. De natura feudi D. De successione feudi E. De contentione feudi F. Qualiter usus beneficii sit tenendus G. Qualiter iudicium feudi sit examinandum [Book 2] H. Explicit liber primus (De cognitione feudi) J. Qualiter iurare debeat vasallus K. Novum non paternum L. In quibus causis feudum amittatur M. Si de feudo vasallus fuerit interpellatus - De pace tenenda N. Hic incipiunt consuetudines regni O. Qui debeant succedere in feudum [-] Que sit forma sacramenti fidelitatis + Quod sit sacramentum fidelitatis iurandum [-] De pace Constancie</p>	<p>Proemium [Book 1] A. Quibus modis feudum acquiratur (c. 1-54) B. Quibus modis feudum amittatur (c. 55-135) C. Que sit natura feudi (c. 136) D. De successione feudi (c. 137) E. De contentione feudi (c. 138) F. Qualiter usus beneficii sit tenendus (c. 139) G. Qualiter iudicium feudi sit examinandum (c. 140) [Book 2] H. De feudi cognitione (Explicit liber primus) (c. 141) J. Qualiter iurare debeat vasallus fidelitatem (c. 142) K. Quid sit novum feudum et paternum (c. 143) L. In quibus casibus feudum amittatur (c. 144) M. De interpellatione feudi (c. 145) N. De consuetudinibus regni (c. 146) O. Qui de consuetudine regni in feudum succedunt (c. 147) T. De capitulis extraordinariis et alterius... (c. 148-9) U. De feudis et beneficiis constitutiones... (c. 150) X. De forma et sacramento fidelitatis (c. 151) Y. De pace tenenda (c. 152) - De poenis inferendis [extra summam](c. 153)</p>	<p>[Book 1] A. Quibus modis feudum acquiratur B. Quibus modis feudum amittatur C. De natura feudi D. De successione feudi E. De contentione feudi F. Qualiter usus beneficii sit tenendus G. Qualiter iudicium feudi sit examinandum [Book 2] H. Explicit liber primus (De cognitione feudi) J. Qualiter iurare debeat vasallus K. Novum non paternum L. In quibus causis feudum amittatur M. Si de feudo vasallus fuerit interpellatus N. Hic incipiunt consuetudines regni O. Qui debeant succedere in feudum [O'] [P] [Q] [R] S. De pace Constancie Extr. I. De capitulis extraordinariis... Extr. II. De feudis et beneficiis... Extr. III. De forma et sacramento fidelitatis Extr. IV. De pace et tregua tenenda et componenda Extr. V. De privilegio scholastico Extr. VI. De privilegiis ecclesiarum</p>